

Class

232.5 Q

Book

R 312

General Theological Seminary Library

Chelsea Square, New York

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by

EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.

DEAN 1879-1902

Resurrectio Christi

Resurrectio Christi

An Apology written from a new
Standpoint and supported by Evidence
some of which is new



London

Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.

Dryden House, Gerrard Street

1909

232.5 9

R 3/2

48068

VIABER CANT DEO

VIABER

VIABER

To
MY FATHER

Preface

I. THE plan of the book is as follows. I first arrive at a theory of the order of the Resurrection appearances and the significance of Pentecost by examining the New Testament accounts in the light of Psychological Research. And then I try to show that the theory so arrived at can be corroborated from many early Christian documents—the Acts of Pilate, the Ethiopian Acts of Peter, the Syriac Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, the Gnostic Apocryphal Acts, the Transitus Mariæ, and the Clementine Recognitions.

II. The editions employed are as follows:—

- (1) Walker: *Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations* (a translation of Tischendorf's texts). (T. & T. Clark.)
- (2) Mrs Lewis: *Mythological Acts of the Apostles* (*Horæ Semiticæ*, No. IV.). (Cambridge Press.)
- (3) Budge: *The Contendings of the Apostles*. (Frowde.)
- (4) Wright: *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, vol. ii. (Williams.) *Out of print*.

- (5) Lipsius and Bonnet: *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*. (Leipzig: Mendelssohn.)
- (6) Mrs Lewis: *Apocrypha Syriaca*, being *Studia Sinaitica*, xi. (Cambridge Press.) This volume contains Mrs Lewis's translation of the *Transitus Mariæ*.
- (7) Mrs Gibson: *Apocrypha Sinaitica*, being *Studia Sinaitica*, v. (Cambridge Press.)
- (8) *The Clementine Recognitions and Homilies*, in Clark's "Antenicene Christian Library."
- (9) Rendel Harris: *Gospel of the Twelve Apostles*. (Cambridge Press.)

III. The quotations from Rendel Harris are from his *The Homeric Centones and the Acts of Pilate* (Cambridge Press). Those from Lipsius are from his article, "Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles," in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, or are repetitions of excerpts made by Mrs Lewis in the Preface to (2) above.

IV. I may add that I should not have ventured on the present attempt but for indications that it was needed. Professor Kirsopp Lake has already prophesied that the next stage of Resurrection criticism is the study of the narrative in the light of Psychical Research. And I find that several years ago now, in the *American Journal of Psychology*, Professor Stanley Hall anticipated Professor Lake. Psychical Research has been mentioned in a general way as the key to the Resurrection problems by the late F. W. H. Myers, Sir Oliver Lodge, and Professor Hyslop.

May I in conclusion make two quotations? The

first is from Origen: "I am of opinion now that the statements in this passage (1 Cor. xv. 5 f.) contain some great and wonderful mysteries, which are beyond the grasp not merely of the great multitude of ordinary believers, but even of those who are far advanced, and that in them the reason would be explained why our Lord did not show Himself after His Resurrection from the dead, in the same manner as before that event." The second is from a writer in the *Cambridge Theological Essays*: "No one can wish anything but God-speed to those who press onward in the hope that a fuller knowledge of the constitution of matter and a closer study of psychic phenomena may enable them in the end to lift the veil."

THE AUTHOR.



Contents

	PAGE
I. The Resurrection and Psychical Research	I
II. Luke the Physician	33
III. The Acts of Pilate	38
Suggestion and Response	
The Five Hundred regarded as Hostile	
Witnesses	
IV. The Ethiopian Acts of Peter. The Syriac	
Gospel of the Twelve Apostles	56
The Five Hundred definitely associated	
with Pentecost	
Pentecost as the Repetition of Christo-	
phanies	
V. The Gnostic Apocryphal Acts	65
Journeys in the Spirit	
Pentecostal Recurrence of the Christo-	
phany of Matt. xxviii. 16 f.	

VI. The Clementine Recognitions .	PAGE 90
The Five Hundred summoned to Pentecost	
Appendix I. The Christophanic Motive in the Acts of Andrew and Matthias . . .	113
Appendix II. A Pentecostal Episode in the Acts of Paul: Whom did the Gnostics origin- ally mean by our Lord's Mother? .	120

Resurrectio Christi

Part I

THE RESURRECTION AND PSYCHICAL RESEARCH

I

THERE appear to be two justifications of the present attempt.

The first is apologetic necessity. An apologist has necessarily to approach the facts which he is defending on the side where they come in contact with the rest of human experience. Men will be persuaded of the truth of the Resurrection only if they can be convinced that it followed laws which can be seen in operation elsewhere.

The second justification is possibly stronger. There are certain definite statements in St Paul which bear quite naturally a telepathic interpretation. When he speaks of the day when it pleased God to reveal His Son in him, he is using terms which suggest that the main feature in the event on the road to Damascus

was what some of us would now call a psychical invasion. Where, but in an experience where the Risen Christ became soul of his very soul, in other words a telepathic experience, are we to find the origin of the Pauline mysticism, the doctrine of the Christ in us? The Hebrew prophets had believed themselves to be the mouthpieces of the Spirit of God ; it is because he had felt himself literally possessed by Christ that for St Paul the terms Spirit of God and Spirit of Christ are synonymous. Salvation is described by Paul now as a process of union, now as a process of substitution. Union and substitution alike are natural descriptions of the relationship between agent and percipient in a telepathic experience. "The greatest problem of all," says Harnack, "is presented by Christology, not indeed in its particular features doctrinally expressed, but in its deepest roots as it was preached by Paul as the principle of a new life, and as it was to many beside him, the expression of a personal union with the exalted Christ." For the student of Psychical Research, the greatest problem of all suggests, by the very way in which it is put, the telepathic solution.

I do not propose to enter here on a study of the evidence for telepathy. Instances alike of the spontaneous and experimental type are so numerous that, as it seems to me, a critic has only two courses—to refuse to read the literature (which I admit is tedious), or to acknowledge that telepathy is proved.

Grant, however, the truth of telepathy, and not only does St Paul's precedent justify our use of the con-

ception, but his obvious acquaintance with telepathic phenomena puts the objective character of at least one Resurrection appearance beyond all doubt. For whence, if not from experience, was his knowledge derived?

What is true of St Paul will be true of the other witnesses. We have, as Christians, nothing to lose, but everything to gain, by admitting that a central element in every Christophany was a spiritual impression effected by the manifesting Lord. "Both Luke and John," says Dean Armitage Robinson, "incidentally suggest to us that the Resurrection of Christ was an act belonging to the spiritual order, transcending and controlling the material."

II

But here we encounter an objection.

I do not indeed agree with those who feel an invincible distaste for the preceding line of argument. It is not in any degree irreverent to suppose even a Divine Person to utilise a law which, in the opinion of Myers, operates as universally in the spiritual world as does gravitation in the material, and which is becoming quite a favourite explanation of the inter-communion of God and man.

But I recognise that a danger exists of making the Resurrection simply one instance among others of *post-mortem* apparition. If, as seems inevitable, the telepathic theory is to oust the subjective vision theory, it behoves us to be on our guard against forms of it which would make our accounts of the Resur-

rection simply exaggerations of a quite ordinary event.

To avoid this danger it is only necessary to follow St Paul a little further.

St Paul does not only make Christ "the principle of a new life." He also attributes to Him cosmic importance. "Through Him are all things, and we through Him" (1 Cor.). "In Him all things hold together" (Col.) or "are summed up" (Eph.). "He is all and in all" (Col.). As long as it was believed that such statements were so many stray texts of a discarded philosophy, it was possible to neglect them. But if an interchange of personality was effected even temporarily between the Lord and the disciple, St Paul's estimate of our Lord's dignity becomes the product of an experience. In this article, at any rate, I propose to take as a postulate that St Paul is right.

III

The historical situation is, in its main outlines, sufficiently clear. Thus there is little doubt that before the Resurrection appearances those of our Lord's followers who had accompanied Him to Jerusalem had fled or were in hiding. Although our Lord had other followers, residents no doubt for the most part of Galilee, there is no indication that these formed in any respect an organised community.

After the Resurrection appearances all this is changed. Not only do we find the fugitive Apostles returned to Jerusalem: we find also established at Jerusalem a Christian Church with its sacraments.

Arguing, then, from the event to the intention, we may say that the object of the Lord in making His appearances was to found a Church by concentrating His scattered followers at Jerusalem.

IV

So far, then, we have three data. Telepathy is the law employed. The Agent is possessed of Cosmic Power. His aim is to concentrate at Jerusalem the floating material which went to form His Church. A short road is preferable to a long one, and if we had no accounts of the Resurrection before us we should presume the phenomena took the form of a Universal Appearance to all believers, and a command, "Go to Jerusalem."

Let us discuss, then, the general possibility of this presumption, and then see if it is so contrary to the evidence as at first appears.

In studying telepathic possibilities a distinction must be drawn between different strata of consciousness. Numerous indications show us that at the deeper levels the capacity of receiving telepathic messages is very considerably enhanced. "In all the phenomena of Psychical Research," says Professor Hyslop, "there is good reason to believe that subliminal or subconscious mental action is the medium through which these phenomena are produced." "If we now pass," says Professor James, "beyond conditions of artificial hypnosis, and take into account states of abstraction like those produced in some persons by crystal-gazing and automatic

writing, and the 'trances' of certain somnambulists and mediums, with the clairvoyant faculty reported to be found therein, we find ourselves obliged (if we credit the reports) to assume that the subliminal life has windows of outlook and doors of ingress which bring it (in some persons, at least) into a commerce, of which the channels entirely escape our observation, with an indefinitely extended region of the world of truth."

No one can read the records of trance mediumship drawn up with such elaborate care by the S.P.R. without coming to one of two conclusions. Either the spiritistic hypothesis is true, in which case the subliminal self is shown to possess telepathic powers beyond those of the waking personality; for it is the subconsciousness of the medium that receives the impressions: or the phenomena are accounted for by subliminal telepathy between the living. But on the latter hypothesis one would probably be compelled to admit not only that the medium is in telepathic rapport with the sitter, but that she reads in the sitter's mind the record of previous impressions received from third parties in the past.

Surely in that supposition there is nothing in the least improbable. If, as Professor Hyslop says, "subliminal or subconscious mental action is the medium through which these phenomena are produced," then for one impression which is strong enough to emerge from the subconsciousness and affect the percipient consciously there must be many which are weaker and fail altogether to gain his

attention. If such impressions were, like many another marginal impression, recorded in the subconsciousness of the sitter, they might well be the source of the information produced by the medium.

Owing to the inevitable tendency which blinds us all to the arguments of the other side, holders of the spiritistic view minimise unduly the weight of the evidence for subliminal telepathy. But the onlooker who has not yet made up his mind will almost inevitably find that, even if communication with the dead is occasionally effected, still a process of subliminal telepathy operating to an extent at present unknown between persons sufficiently interested in one another is at least a contributory cause of the phenomena.

The recent experiments of the S.P.R. (see Parts LV. and LVII. of their Proceedings) are very generally admitted to require for their explanation—if one excludes the possibility of communication with the dead—subliminal telepathy between the automatists. But an “*automatist*” is not necessarily a very different being from the rest of us. Automatic writing—writing, that is to say, performed by the hand without the control of the normal consciousness—is simply a means by which, after continued practice, a fragment of the subconsciousness is split off and enabled to reveal itself to our observation. There seems no reason why practice in writing should convey to the subconsciousness supernormal powers of which it was previously destitute. And the experiments alluded to seem only to prove that suggestion and

auto-suggestion can induce a fragment of the sub-consciousness to select from the general mass of subconscious impressions those likely to further a definite end.

Accordingly, if it be urged that supraliminally the Universal Christophany was an impossibility, we may still involve for its explanation that subliminal telepathy which operates so frequently, and the limits of which are so undetermined.

Here, however, we come upon a difficulty. The mere abstract possibility of a Universal Christophany is of no use to us. Granted our Lord produced this impression on the disciples, then, just because it was a subconscious impression, it would, like the communication from friend to sitter above, have been unrecollected in waking life. What we require is not an abstract possibility but a practical. If they had an experience of which they were unconscious, what brought the witnesses to Jerusalem? And if their experience was never recollected, how can they be called witnesses at all?

As regards the arrival at Jerusalem, the solution is easy. A latent impression may still produce an effect. We see this every day in the well-known phenomenon of post-hypnotic suggestion. An awakened hypnotised subject carries out suggestions made to him in the trance, although he has no knowledge whatever of why he does so. It was only necessary, therefore, for our Lord to impress the sub-consciousness of the witnesses with the suggestion "Go to Jerusalem," and to Jerusalem they would have gone.

The second question, Was the memory of the Universal Christophany recovered? and if so, how? is a little more difficult. But the analogy of hypnotism again comes to our aid. Trance memory is continuous; hypnotic subjects remember, when entranced, the happenings of previous trances. Our difficulty, then, simply points us to Pentecost. The main feature of Pentecost on the human side was just this: the subconsciousness of the believers came to the surface. All that we know of Pentecost and its subsequent repetition in the exercise of spiritual gifts shows that Pentecost was simply the exhibition of subliminal activity by persons in a state of trance. The reader must often have found a difficulty in these phenomena. In themselves they are not distinctively Christian. But they possess, as we can now see, a very considerable importance if, as the subconsciousness of the witnesses came to the fore, its hidden memories were elicited, and among them the memory of the Universal Christophany.

I may add that this theory of Pentecost is corroborated in a quite remarkable way by an Ethiopian apocryphal document of uncertain date known as the Acts of Peter. For there the "men of the Hebrews" present on the day of Pentecost are, like St Paul's witnesses to the Christophanies, "more in number than five hundred."

V

The question to be discussed is, What support, if any, is given to the idea of a Universal Christophany

by the evidence? Three lines of argument are relevant.

St Matthew's Gospel ends with the story of a Christophany on a Galilean mountain. That the scene of the Universal Christophany should be laid in Galilee is only natural. The great majority of the percipients—over five hundred brethren, according to St Paul—were, beyond question, at their Galilean homes. That others besides the twelve were present at the vision we are discussing is to be gathered from St Matthew's reference to the bystanders' doubts. The mountain is unidentified, and probably, as Loisy says, symbolic. If any mountain is thought of, it is the Mountain of the Great Sermon. To this mysterious mountain the twelve repair. But their journey is introduced by so flagrant a contradiction of St Mark's statement that the message of the angels was never delivered, that one is justified in regarding it as a naïve attempt to translate into physical terms a purely psychical experience. Themselves at a distance from Galilee, perhaps on their way thither, perhaps in hiding quite close to Jerusalem, the twelve were nevertheless somehow associated in the Universal Christophany with their Galilean brethren, and a journey was the only way in which this could be explained. Lastly, the description of the interview with the Risen Lord is very peculiar. It has been described as a "free fusion of the Christophanies" (B. Weiss), or as a "résumé synthétique des traditions relatives à la résurrection" (Loisy). But the mere existence of such a "free fusion" or

"summary" seems to need as a basis the very fact for which I am pleading, the universal character of the so-called Galilean Christophany.

Notice that this reading of the passage affords an opportunity for the twelve, and other percipients nearest to Jerusalem, to return thither and even be assembled, as St Luke says they were, in the Upper Chamber on the evening of Easterday.

This, however, leads me to the second line of argument, viz. the light shed by the Universal Christophany and the return of all witnesses to Jerusalem upon the most pressing of difficulties, the notorious contradiction as to whether the scene of the Christophanies was Galilee or Judæa.

St Matthew knows of no appearance at Jerusalem except that to the women. The women, of course, are so many individual members of the five hundred, so many witnesses of the Universal Christophany. Hence their omission from St Paul's list of witnesses in 1 Cor. xv. The experience of the women recorded, St Matthew passes to Galilee.

If St Matthew rejects the appearance to Apostles at Jerusalem, equally definitely St Luke rejects the Galilean appearance of St Matthew. "St Luke," says Dr Arthur Wright, "seems to exclude the journey into Galilee." He describes, indeed, an appearance to two persons who may well be members of the five hundred, like St Matthew's women; but he is careful to show that the witnesses in question were after all not very far from Jerusalem. He mentions also an appearance to St Peter. The reason why he lets the

appearance go with a mere mention has been admirably discussed by that astutest of critics, Loisy. The appearance to St Peter, Loisy concludes, was so important that it could not be altogether omitted. At the same time, it was so definitely associated with Galilee, that any account of it, any but the merest allusion, was, on St Luke's premises, impossible. But with this admission, not as I would say of the Galilean Christophanies so much as of St Peter's participation in the same experiences as the Galilean witnesses, St Luke's concessions stop. With a definiteness which is the exact contrary of the vagueness of St Matthew, he assigns to the Upper Chamber at Jerusalem a final appearance to the Apostles.

On the whole, then, we may say that the contradiction between Galilee and Jerusalem is absolute.

It is the beauty of my theory that a contradiction which is a difficulty to any other theory of an objective Resurrection becomes one of its main supports.

For, after all, under what conditions would Christophanies in Galilee and at Jerusalem appear to the early Christians incompatible? Or, if one may assume that men who lived near to the events were willing to accept both versions as "mysteries," Divine facts transcending our little limits of time and space, what are the conditions under which the mere historian, painfully manipulating the facts in front of him, would find it impossible to include Christophanies at two places into a connected narrative?

Surely the conditions are before us. Certain of the witnesses must be, so to say, links. They must

have participated in the Universal Christophany which was allocated to Galilee. And yet there must have been very good reason to suppose they were, at the very time of the alleged Galilean experience, not in Galilee at all, but in Jerusalem. Thus both traditions have their basis of fact: St Matthew's in the community of experience between the twelve and the Galilean brethren: St Luke's in the fact (the literal exactness of which is, however, by no means necessary) that the twelve were so close to Jerusalem that they could reach it by Easternight.

As we shall see, there were two contributory causes which emphasised the contradiction still further. The experience of the twelve themselves involved a vision of a distinctively Galilean setting, so that they themselves would hardly know whether they had been transported to Galilee "in the spirit" or not: and also at Jerusalem they had a second vision; for the group of all the Apostles mentioned by St Paul must obviously have included the twelve. But even if we leave the contributory causes out of account, sufficient reason for the contradiction is given in the discrepancy between the local situation of the twelve and the scene which the Church assigned to the Universal Vision. [We shall see in the sequel that there was a very good reason why the twelve should *be seen* by the five hundred. And the contradiction then becomes simply one between where the twelve *were*, and where the twelve *were seen*.]

The third argument for the Universal Christophany is simple. St Paul tells us that the Risen Lord

appeared to over five hundred persons once for all, *i.e.* the appearance is final; the Corinthians, for example, are not to expect a repetition. The Church had its Universal Vision, but representatively, and once for all. (For the rendering "at once" is a mistranslation.)

Of these five hundred persons our Gospels make no mention.

The old idea that the appearance to the five hundred was one to a crowd assembled in physical presence in one spot lies open to two difficulties: first, the difficulty of supposing an occasion for the meeting; secondly, the difficulty of explaining why the recollection of so important a gathering has been lost. From St Paul's statement ("of whom the greater part remains unto this present, but some are fallen asleep") it is clear that the testimony of the five hundred was regarded as the best of all proofs of the Resurrection. And yet in the Gospels we hear nothing whatever about them.

On my hypothesis the omission is accounted for. A Universal Appearance to five hundred persons, wherever they might be, could be received as a fact, but it could not be recounted.

VI

Two remarks upon the preceding argument will suggest themselves to anyone versed in the literature of the Resurrection. We have taken no notice of St Paul's differentiation of his witnesses into groups. And we have left out of account John xxi.

St Paul is of course our most important witness. His list would seem to be the official one drawn up within a few years of the Resurrection. Moreover, St Paul had every opportunity to corroborate it by conversations with Peter, James, and others. And John xxi. is second in importance only to St Paul. Rohrbach and Harnack make it the clue to the lost ending of Mark. And even Loisy, who thinks Mark ended from the first with the message entrusted to the women, regards John xxi. as representative of the earliest tradition.

Two reasons for attributing this high value to John xxi. may be mentioned:—(1) Certain of its features have found their way into the synoptic narratives. The draught of fishes in Luke seems a misplaced version of the draught in John. And the walking of Peter on the waves in Matthew is a version of the swimming of Peter to the shore. (2) The chapter describes the restoration of St Peter after his denial. This, and indeed the prominence attributed to St Peter throughout, accords with St Paul's mention of St Peter as the percipient of the first Christophany.

If, then, St Paul and John xxi. are so important, our omissions must now be repaired. Note, in the first place, that a thread of relationship connects the passages.

For I regard John xxi. as describing just that private and particular experience of Peter and the twelve which is mentioned by St Paul.

It might be thought St Paul speaks of St Peter

and the twelve separately because they were nearer Jerusalem than the rest. But intrinsic probability and the evidence of John xxi. suggest rather that the real basis of the differentiation was psychological.

A psychological differentiation among the witnesses even to a Universal Christophany is *a priori* probable, since telepathic possibilities depend largely on the emotional ties which bind together agent and percipient. We may well suppose a closer bond to unite our Lord to the disciples who had been His constant companions, than to those who had been after all merely the sympathetic hearers of His message. Not only would the same law of telepathy which confined His appearances to His friends cause Him to appear, as St Paul says He did appear, to His nearest friends first, but it might associate the closest of these friends in an experience from which the others were debarred. The differentiation from the five hundred might have consisted not only in peculiarities in the content of their vision, but also—since communication with them was so much easier—in the emergence of that vision to a level at which it could be recollected by the normal consciousness.

That John xxi. does as a matter of fact represent a psychical experience is clear. It contains, as we saw, the restoration of St Peter. But the restoration of St Peter must have been one of the first acts of the Risen Lord. We cannot imagine Him appearing to Peter and the twelve without effecting it. The situation required it. The story, then, is unmistakably a story of Easterday. But it is surely all but im-

possible that the disciples could reach Galilee and resume their trade so early. To deny that it describes a vision is simply to discredit the whole account. The particular psychological reason which makes the vision a Vision of a Lake will appear in due time. But that our Lord's combined thought of several of His favourite disciples should produce in their minds some consciousness of mutual presence is not surprising. And that this consciousness of presence should translate itself into a symbolic vision of some kind is just what a student would expect.

Not only, however, does St John xxi. corroborate St Paul by supplying the narrative of a private experience of the twelve. The agreement extends further. Both passages alike suggest that the several successive appearances of the Risen Lord were not isolated, but formed crests, so to speak, of one continuously spreading wave.

The acutest criticism of St Paul's list is that of Weizsäcker :—

“ The separate events enumerated by St Paul were without doubt related to each other in a causal series, and started from an initial impulse. Peter began the great movement. At a later period a new epoch may be referred to James, if only because he, too, in his turn precedes a number in St Paul's summary. That list indicates clearly enough the kind of movement that, starting from a circle, continued in wider and wider rings. Peter's experience became that of his companions, first in a narrower and then in a wider circle.”

I accept this reading of the list as a double series of causally connected Christophanies, and I would define the causal connection as telepathic. The list would seem to hint that union with the Risen Lord was first effected in the case of Simon Peter, and that thereafter the spiritual impulse widened so as to embrace first the twelve and then the five hundred. With the subconscious vision of the five hundred the process for the moment stopped. After an interval it was repeated, an appearance to James being mirrored in one to all the Apostles.

The corroboration afforded to the view by John xxi. is this. We should expect that in the appearance to the twelve, telepathically dependent on that to Peter, Peter would be prominent. Prominent, in John xxi., he is.

We see now the reason why, in St Matthew's description of the Universal Christophany, our Lord appears surrounded by the twelve. The experience of the five hundred succeeds in St Paul that of the twelve, and the prominence of the twelve in Matthew is due to the same causes as the prominence of St Peter in John xxi. How exactly the telepathic interconnection was obtained will appear later.

The telepathic interconnection of Christophanies is of such supreme importance for my theory that I end this chapter with an illustration which shows it extended to the second series of Christophanies as well as to the first.

Take the two appearances to James and to all the Apostles. If telepathically interconnected, we should

THE EUCHARISTIC CHRISTOPHANY 19

expect the same feature in both. But, if we can trust the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the appearance of James was Eucharistic. "Bring, said the Lord, a table and bread," etc. Eucharistic also is the appearance to all the Apostles in Luke.

Neither the differentiation of Christophanies nor their interconnection are in any degree inconsistent with the idea of a universal Christophany. Light impinges universally on the outside of the house where I am writing. But it only enters the house through windows. And within the house it is reflected from this object or that.

VII

We are now nearly in a position to approach gradually the problem of the Physical Resurrection. But before doing so it is necessary to try to strengthen the position adopted in treating the incident of the Upper Chamber in Luke as, *par excellence*, the Eucharistic Christophany.

It was Loisy who first demonstrated the general connection between Christophany and Eucharist.¹ "The faith in Christ risen—and the faith in Christ present for His own in the common meal, the Eucharistic Feast, grew together and are inseparable."

¹ See, too, in early Christian literature (1) *Martyrium Matthæi*, Walker, p. 384, "Communicate with me as the Lord Jesus showed us how to offer up when He rose from the dead on the third day"; (2) Forbes Robinson's *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*, p. 51, "Peter sanctified an altar even as the Lord taught us before He suffered; and again after He rose from the dead He taught us again."

John xxi., the Emmaus narrative and its sequel in Luke, refer to the Eucharist explicitly, and John xx. implies it.

An implicit reference need not detain us. Our task is thus reduced to establishing the importance of the gathering in the Upper Chamber as against the Emmaus narrative and the Eucharist upon the Shore. A little reflection will carry the reduction further. For the Eucharist alike of the two and of the seven are instances of one and the same phenomenon, the insertion of a Eucharistic element in the first or Universal Christophany.

Confining ourselves, then, to John xxi., we may regard the Eucharist described in one of two ways.

In the first place we may pronounce it an artificial addition. The narrator, like Matthew, is compelled to exclude the Jerusalem half of the witnesses' experience. Even as regards the Universal Christophany his testimony is incomplete. The mysterious words "Follow me" seem intended to point us onward to that further dissemination of the Universal Christophany which it is possible only to indicate. But at an appearance in Jerusalem the author, as an adherent of the Galilean tradition, cannot even hint. At the same time, he wishes his narrative to be a complete one. And because the Eucharist was so essential a factor that its inclusion was imperative, he translates it to Galilee.

Such a theory, however, is open to objection. Traditions are not fabricated ; they grow. Here, as throughout, psychological explanations, where feasible,

are best. It will be quite enough for our present purpose if we can show that the Eucharist might well figure in the visions which were part of the Universal Christophany, just as the Emmaus narrative and John xxi. say it did, but that a Eucharistic tinge does not necessarily make the vision which it colours a distinctively Eucharistic Christophany.

We have seen that the inner reality of any Christophanic experience was a reflection of the Mind of Christ. In proportion as this reflection was perfect, Christ's aims and purposes would be to the witnesses as their own. Even if the Spiritual Possession was only partial, their visions must have been coloured by His main purposes. And so if it was His intention—surely a most natural one—to close the Christophanies with a Eucharistic one, the final pledge of His abiding Presence, then nothing is more likely than that this intention should be symbolised in certain features of their dream.

The Eucharist on the Shore or in the House of Emmaus, so far from being rival versions of the Jerusalem Eucharist, are really the best proof that it occurred. For they show that our Lord's intention was already set upon the Upper Chamber. They are prophecy and anticipation of an occasion when the Eucharist should be reinstituted with greater and more definite stress.

If, however, the Upper Chamber was the real scene of the distinctively Eucharistic Christophany, and if all the Apostles were its witnesses, the point is of the utmost importance.

For the conditions were quite different at this final meeting than at the Universal Christophany. Then, our Lord had appeared to a number of scattered individuals; now, to a number assembled together in one place. Then, His energy had been diffused; now, it is concentrated. Then, He had appeared to men who were dejected and full of doubts; now, to men strung to that pitch of expectant attention which was always the necessary condition of His miracles.

Incomplete as is our knowledge of that obscurest of all subjects, the Psychology of Crowds, we must admit that if ever it was our Lord's intention to clothe His Spirit with material form, here, in the expectant hush of the Upper Chamber, was the great opportunity.

Two things are clear. First, that the Psychical Force already displayed in the Universal Christophany was enormous. Secondly, that this grouping together of some seventy persons under the most favourable conditions had been deliberately planned.

Nevertheless, one must not shirk the difficulties. No completeness in the apparent reality of our Lord's Body can establish the Physical Resurrection. For hallucinations of touch are as possible as hallucinations of sight.

The only way at present in which we can strengthen the case for a Physical Appearance in the Upper Chamber is by attempting to show that to prove a Physical Resurrection was part of our Lord's purpose. I attempt this in another chapter.

VIII

The mere occurrence of a Eucharistic Christophany shows at any rate this: that a repetition, or, as I should prefer to say, an authoritative reinstitution of one of the Christian Sacraments, was distinctly an object of the Risen Lord. It is also to be noticed that the reinstitution in question was effected not so much by prescription as by act.

But there are two Christian Sacraments. And so analogy suggests not only that tradition is right in associating with the Resurrection appearances the institution of Baptism, but that this institution, like that of the Eucharist, may have been effected by a definite act. Symmetry, moreover—and in a course of actions so purposive as the Resurrection Manifestations symmetry is to be expected—symmetry would support the idea that just as the second series of St Paul was Eucharistic, so the first was in some way Baptismal.

At first sight this latter requirement may seem somewhat obscure. But one way in which the Petrine series of Christophanies could be considered Baptismal becomes apparent, if we apply the conception of telepathy to the interpretation of certain statements of St Paul. St Paul twice describes Baptism as the process of *being buried and rising with Christ*. If the visible manifestation to St Peter was preceded by some symbolical representation of the process of burial, including as a main feature that washing of the body which was a preparation for the grave, then

St Peter and others who might share in the experience might well be said to have been buried and to have risen with Christ, while the washing was obviously the connecting link between the two ideas of Burial and ceremonial Baptism.

Such a symbolic representation of the fact of burial presents no very great difficulty to the sympathetic student of Psychical Research. For if he admits the possibility of *post-mortem* apparition as well as of apparitions at the moment of death, then he will find instances in abundance to support the statement of Myers: "There is often knowledge of some circumstance connected with the deceased person's own death, as the appearance of a body after dissolution, or the place of temporary deposit or final burial."

Once again we have seen that the experience of the twelve telepathically connected with that of Peter took the shape of the vision of the Lake. But why a Lake? And why does Peter's meeting with the Risen Lord involve his passage through the water? The answer is that the whole train of dream imagery is set in motion by Peter's Baptism.

Probably the Baptism of Peter, when he died and was "buried with" Christ, is the origin of the allusion in John xxi. to Peter's death.

There is much additional evidence that might be adduced. Probably, for instance, Baptism in this sense is the origin of the tradition of the Resurrection of the dead bodies of the saints. Various apocryphal documents seem to corroborate our view of Baptism.

In particular, the appearance to Joseph of Arimathea in the Gospel of Nicodemus gives us what I should consider a typical instance of the Baptismal side of the Universal Christophany. The washing, the perfume, the wiping of the face, the kiss, are all described in a way suggestive equally of the ritual of Baptism and of the preparation of a body for the grave.

The importance of the Baptismal element in the Christophanies can hardly be exaggerated.

It implies that to convey the impression of a Physical Resurrection was distinctly a motive of the Manifesting Lord. This suggests a further problem: Was the conveyance of the impression a justifiable accommodation to the idea of a time which could frame no conception of a non-Physical Resurrection? Or was it a declaration of absolute truth?

Once again. Acknowledge that it was an object of the Manifesting Lord to convey this impression, and the likelihood is increased of His taking supplementary measures in the same direction. The disappearance of the Body from the tomb becomes one of a series of acts directed to an end. The contradiction as to why the women visited the tomb shows that they did so neither to anoint the Body nor with any other definite purpose, but in response to a subconscious suggestion from the Risen Lord.

Lastly, we left undecided the physical reality of the form in which our Lord appeared in the Upper Chamber. But now it is possible to argue that just as the Eucharistic features in the three appearances

to James and all the Apostles throw light on the series of appearances which began with Peter, by leading us to predicate an actual experience of Baptism, so the Baptismal Christophany in its turn sheds light on the Eucharistic : the intention of the Lord to prove the reality of His Physical Resurrection will extend to the phenomena throughout.

IX

And now let us approach what is possibly the most difficult question of all, the period taken up by the Manifestations. All our authorities are agreed that they began on Easterday. But how long did they continue?

The definite statements available are three:—St Luke in his Gospel confines all appearances to Easterday ; in the Acts he makes the number of days forty ; John xx. puts the final appearance on the first Sunday after Easter.

St Luke's statement that all appearances were confined to one day need not perhaps detain us. For, in the first place, St Luke himself practically acknowledges that he had been mistaken. And in the second place, the idea that the numerous appearances mentioned by St Paul could all take place in twenty-four hours is too improbable to be very seriously maintained.

On the other hand, the extension of the period from one day to forty is not one to be accepted blindly. The phrase "forty days" is simply a general one for a fairly considerable period. It amounts to a con-

fession that St Luke found the exact interval impossible to determine.

That of course all the Christophanies could not have occurred in a single day is certain. But any attempt to extend the period not based upon definite information is open to an obvious objection. Any man ignorant of telepathic possibilities is much more likely to exaggerate than to underrate the time required for a series of telepathic appearances.

I am inclined, for many reasons, to follow St John, and make the real date of the Final Eucharistic Christophany to all the Apostles the first Sunday after Easter.

The answer to the objection that the location on a Sunday looks artificial is that because Sunday was so suitable is the reason it was chosen. Our Lord's action was purposive throughout.

There is one point of view from which a week would suit our Lord's purposes very exactly. His final appearance was not made to a number of persons taken at random, but to all the Apostles, *i.e.*, surely, to those members of the five hundred who were best qualified to join with the original twelve in testifying to the fact of the Resurrection. It would be easy for our Lord so to arrange the order of His Manifestations that selected witnesses could reach Jerusalem before the rest. The summons to Jerusalem would be in itself the call to Apostolic office of those who were the first to receive and to obey it. From this point of view, it would be necessary for the period which preceded the appearance to all the

Apostles to be long enough for every suitable candidate to have time for the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. On the other hand, it was equally necessary that the interval before the appearance should not be too long. Otherwise, the group of the Apostles would become an unnecessarily large one.

X

In all our accounts of the vision of the five hundred—whether we take Matthew as our guide or the documents soon to be examined—what the five hundred see is not the Risen Lord as a Solitary Figure, but the Risen Lord as the Centre of a Group. In all the visions He is surrounded by the twelve. It would be just as true to say the five hundred had a vision of the twelve as to say they had a vision of the Saviour.

The constant prevalence of this vision of the twelve has surely to be accounted for. And it is accounted for in a way which few students of such matters would dispute if we assume that the twelve not only returned to Jerusalem as a result of the boat vision, but spent the next succeeding days in prayer, so that the vision of the group of twelve is simply a telepathic projection of the twelve united in prayer to the Risen Christ and intercession for the absent brethren. For prayer, after all, is a perfect form of telepathic transmission, and the week of prayer would place the supplicants continually *en rapport* with the Risen Lord, and also, so far as their prayers were intercessory, with the Galileans.

Such a power of spiritual excursion or spiritual visitation of other believers by an Apostle engaged in prayer is moreover actually claimed for himself by St Paul in Col. ii. 5 and 1 Cor. v. 4. Though absent in the flesh, he can be with the Colossians in the spirit, joying and beholding their order and the steadfastness of their faith in Christ; though absent in body, he can be associated in spirit in the judicial proceedings of the Corinthians: the Corinthians and the spirit of Paul can be *gathered together*, with the Power of the Lord Jesus Christ. Either St Paul could consciously exercise the power, in which case we may argue that it was first evinced by the twelve in the Upper Chamber; or he does not consciously exercise it, but simply assumes that since the twelve had exercised it in the way we have seen, he, as an Apostle, must possess it too.

Here, then, we reach a point of view from which the discrepancy between Galilee and Jerusalem becomes negligible. For the picture of assembled Apostles which the Galilean witnesses see in their vision is transmitted to them from the Upper Chamber at Jerusalem. Matthew is perfectly right when he says the twelve were seen in Galilee; Luke is perfectly right when he says they were at Jerusalem all the time.

XI

There are further considerations which favour the conclusions of the last chapter.

For instance, my view seems supported by the *rhythm* of St Paul's list in 1 Cor. xv. 5 f. The

short, sharp ὥφθη Κηφᾶ, εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα is contrasted with the long-drawn-out clause which describes the appearance to the five hundred.

But the main question, of course, is the psychological one: Was it possible for our Lord to appear to the rest of the five hundred (the five hundred minus the Apostles) in the three or four days of the week which remained between the appearance which set the last of the seventy journeying to Jerusalem and the appearance of the Sunday next after Easter?

I would reply, easily possible. In the first place, as man after man reached the Upper Chamber and joined the group engaged in prayer, or even as man after man prayed as he travelled towards Jerusalem, the spiritual force exerted by the Apostles was progressively increasing.

Moreover, there is nothing really to hinder the view that many of the appearances to the five hundred were simultaneous.

Whether, under ordinary conditions, telepathic manifestations ever occur simultaneously to several percipients is doubtful. There are instances alleged in *Phantasms of the Living*, but they are insufficient in number and quality to prove a case. But even if, generally speaking, simultaneous appearances are impossible the reason is obvious. They would require, on the part of the transmitter, a simultaneous concentration of thought upon two percipients at the same time, and such a concentration is prevented by the constitution of the human mind.

But — with our praying group in the Upper

Chamber, increasing throughout the week from twelve to seventy — the conditions are changed. Simultaneous concentration of thought upon different percipients could be effected by the instrumentality of the praying group, each member of whom (if we press the argument to its limit) might be praying for a different individual. In each member or each little group of three or four members of the Apostolic group the Manifesting Lord had, so to speak, an organ at His disposal by which a manifestation to a Galilean witness was possible. And there seems no reason why, by multiplying the organs, He might not multiply the manifestations.

Moreover, there is no need to assume that in the case of all percipients the communicated vision should be of a very definite character. All that was needed was the conveyance of the suggestion to come to Jerusalem. It was only at Pentecost that the full content of the vision of the five hundred emerged. And at Pentecost the circumstances were such as to render it impossible to say whether a vision there recounted by a given witness had really been seen by him at the time of the Christophanies, or had been telepathically transferred to him from someone else at Pentecost itself.

XII

Our conclusion then, so far, might be expressed somewhat as follows:—

We find the conception of a Cosmic Christ deliberately aiming at the establishment of a Church

wonderfully illuminative of the evidence as it has come down to us. We find that the employment of subliminal telepathy partly to intimate the fact of the Resurrection, partly to implant in the witnesses the impulse to repair to a rendezvous, would, taken in connection with the provision for a supraliminal experience in the case of some witnesses, and the emergence of the original impressions in the case of all, fill in all the gaps of our narratives, and make of a string of fragments a united whole. We find, however, even more than this. We find in the Resurrection appearances not only power but purposiveness, a unique scheme of perfect organisation that suggests an Intelligence at work that is more than man—an Intelligence that not only employs telepathic law to the utmost limits of the possible, but initiates and controls its employment by others. If, finally, we were right in contending that the very foundation of the first series of manifestations was Baptism, that a Eucharist was the culmination of the second, that the machinery which rendered the manifestations in Galilee possible was Worship and Intercession—it can hardly be doubted that the Catholic position is materially strengthened.

Part II

LUKE THE PHYSICIAN

I

IF Harnack is right in supposing that St Luke, the companion of St Paul, wrote the Third Gospel and the Acts, then obviously it should be possible to reconcile St Luke's account of the Resurrection with St Paul's and with the facts. And the best credential of any theory of the Resurrection will be its agreement with St Luke.

Consider first the scene of the Christophanies. The author of the third Gospel shows knowledge of the great discrepancy when he emends the message of the angels, and suppresses our Lord's declaration of an intention to go before the disciples into Galilee. That is to say, on Professor Harnack's hypothesis, a man with full opportunities of knowledge, with sufficient historical capacity, deliberately tells us that the eleven never went far from the Holy City. No amount of anonymous evidence to the contrary effect can upset St Luke's decision.

Nor is there the slightest reason to question it. The advent of Psychical Research into the field of

controversy has removed the only possible objection. We are forced no longer to predicate a physical message to reach the scattered disciples in their places of concealment or flight: they could be, as we have seen, reassembled by means purely spiritual. Moreover, we have found above abundant reason for thinking the idea of a journey into Galilee an inevitable mistake: the disciples, really at Jerusalem, were *seen* in Galilee.

II

After the scene of the Christophanies, the most important question is their order. That order was, according to St Paul: Peter, the twelve, the five hundred, James, all the Apostles.

1. St Luke shows implicit knowledge of the Vision of the twelve.

For consider; when we examined the accounts of that Vision, we saw that it consisted in the participation by certain others of the twelve in an experience of Peter's. If Matt. xiv. 28 f. be the earlier and more authentic narrative of the events, then what the twelve saw was Peter trying to walk upon the waves, Peter sinking, Peter being raised by the outstretched hand of the Risen Lord. Even in John xxi. the protagonist is Peter. When, then, as the result of their vision, the twelve came up to Jerusalem, what better reason for their coming could they give than the one put into their mouths by St Luke, "The Lord hath risen indeed and hath appeared unto Simon" (Luke xxiv. 34)?

2. But St Luke does more than show implicit

knowledge of the Vision which brought the twelve to the Upper Chamber ; he follows the Pauline order of appearances throughout, alike (*a*) in the Gospel and (*b*) in the Acts.

(*a*) Take first the Gospel. If the five hundred were simply, as we have seen, the whole body of adherents whom our Lord successively called to Jerusalem, then the two Emmaus disciples become simply two of the five hundred.

Once again, if the group "all the Apostles" be those of the five hundred who reached Jerusalem in time for the final Eucharistic Manifestation in the Upper Chamber, then the Emmaus pair are also two "Apostles."

Well, the Emmaus pair, like all the members of the Apostolic group who were not of the number of the twelve, reach Jerusalem later than the twelve did : they find the eleven and others *already* gathered together.

If, then, we concentrate our attention on the order of arrival at the Upper Chamber, we find St Luke's order the correct one. First come the twelve, then those of the five hundred who formed, with the twelve, the Apostolic College.

And if one admits—it is certainly plausible—that the Eucharist in the house at Emmaus is intended to represent the Eucharistic element in the appearance to James, then there remains in St Luke's account one flaw, and only one: the manifestation to two disciples is a poor substitute for that to the whole five hundred. But the order of arrival is correct.

(b) It is St Luke's consciousness that he had not allowed sufficient time for the manifestations to the five hundred which causes the extension of the period from one day to forty in the Acts.

There is nothing to show that St Luke ever contemplates the Apostles leaving the Upper Chamber. He simply assumes that they were there long enough for all the five hundred to see them in the visions seen from a distance, which he finds it impossible to describe. The words *ὁπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς καὶ λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ* simply represent the natural deduction made by the five hundred from the series of visions which one after another they saw. During whatever time the visions had continued, the Lord had been giving to the Apostles glimpses of His Presence, and instructions regarding His Church: of these manifestations and directions the five hundred had been witnesses, though witnesses only from outside. The proceedings indicated by St Luke are the same as those indicated by St Matthew. Both alike describe the Universal Chistophany. The only differences are two. St Luke makes the scene the Upper Chamber where the Apostles were; St Matthew makes it Galilee, where the five hundred were. St Matthew reduces the period to a point; St Luke unduly prolongs it.

Lastly, as soon as these appearances to the five hundred are over, St Luke returns to the farewell appearance to all the Apostles, which in the Gospel had been antedated, though not misplaced.

III

Finally, it is obviously our duty to see if St Luke has no testimony to offer with respect to that part of our theory which regarded the subliminal visions of the Galilean adherents as made manifest at Pentecost. It must be admitted that his account of Pentecost itself is concerned mainly with the gift of tongues. The gift of tongues we shall discuss later. Nevertheless, though his direct testimony is inconclusive, St Luke gives us indirect testimony of great importance in his idea, which constantly recurs, that Baptism is incomplete without that descent of the Holy Spirit which follows upon the imposition of hands. For this belief implies that the secret entry of Christ into the believer's heart which takes place at Baptism is capable of being rendered by what is after all a sort of repetition of Pentecost, no longer secret, but open and manifest to all. In other words, the original experience of the Church is to be perpetuated. Baptism is a substitute for the Universal Christophany—when Christ, all unseen, had entered the Church's heart. And so, like the Christophany which it represents, Baptism requires its Pentecost.

Part III

THE ACTS OF PILATE

SUGGESTION AND RESPONSE—THE FIVE HUNDRED REGARDED AS HOSTILE WITNESSES

I

I PROPOSE to show that a great part of the Acts of Pilate or Gospel of Nicodemus consists of pseudonymous statements made (as the result of suggestion) by entranced witnesses on different occasions of the exercise of spiritual gifts.

This is in itself a valuable corroboration of my theory. I have urged that the significance of Pentecost lay in the recovery of subliminal memories of the Universal Christophany by witnesses in a state of trance. The probability of this being so is obviously enhanced by a proof that other symptoms of subliminal activity were exhibited by the early Christians. Nothing, however, is more characteristic of subliminal activity than suggestibility.

But the interpretation of Pentecost is after all only one half of my theory, and I hope to show that these same pseudonymous statements, the early date of

which seems guaranteed by the way in which they were obtained, lend considerable support to my view of the Resurrection appearances, especially that to the five hundred.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DOCUMENTS

The Acts of Pilate fall into three divisions:—

- I. Account of the Trial and Crucifixion.
- II. Account of the Resurrection.
- III. The Descensus ad Inferos.

Tischendorf gives I. and II. in two Greek recensions (generally known as A and B) and one Latin recension ; III. is represented by a Greek form and two Latin. Translations from Tischendorf's texts are to be found in Walker.

PREVIOUS CRITICISM

The question of the date of the Acts of Pilate has been the subject of keen but barren controversy, into which it is unnecessary for us to enter. I am not concerned with the date of the work as a whole. I simply assert that behind one portion, viz. the Resurrection portion, lie documents of a very early date.

My justification is alike general and special. Adherents of every variety of date for the work as a whole seem perfectly ready to admit the possibility of "underlying documents drawn from some early strata of Christian tradition." And Rendel Harris has pointed out that it is in the Resurrection portion of Recension A that we find a "series of remarkable

Hebraisms, which can hardly be artificial, for which either an explanation must be found or allowance made :—

“ In chapter xii. we have :

τῷ δὲ σαββάτῳ ὄρον ὥρισαν, κτέ :

in chapter xiv. :

εἰς τί οὖν ἡ φλυαρία αὕτη ἣν ἐφλυαρήσατε ;

and again :

ἐκόπτοντο κοπετὸν μέγαν :

in chapter xv. :

οἶδαμεν ὅτι βουλὴν κακὴν ἐβουλευσάμεθα :

and to these four instances of the verb with cognate accusative we add three of the substantive verb with infinitive, viz. :—

chapter xv., *λύπη ἐλυπήθημεν ὅτι ἡτήσω τὸ σῶμα :*

εἰάν ἀκούσῃ τῶν προσταγμάτων φυγῇ φεύγει

chapter xvi., *γινώσκοντες γνώσεσθε οἶκος Ἰακώβ*

ὅτι γέγραπται.

None of these features are found in recension B.”

II

I proceed to my own theory.

The real clue to the Acts of Pilate is simple. The chapters which we have seen to be probably based on a Hebrew original are written round three statements : (1) the statement of Joseph, (2) the statement of the guards at the tomb, (3) the joint statement of Phinees a priest, Adas a teacher, and Haggai a Levite.

The three statements are of one type. They are instances of testimony to the Resurrection elicited from non-Christians.

There are two problems: the production of the statements, the manufacture of the context in which they appear.

The production is easily accounted for. The entranced witnesses at some occasion of the display of spiritual gifts were surrounded by other persons, some of them the victims of doubt (Matt. xxviii. 17, Mark xvi. 11, 16, mention doubts at the Resurrection; Acts ii. 13, at Pentecost).

The doubters, possibly from their participation in the Baptismal Christophany, possibly from the allegations of others, were half inclined to admit, or possibly even admitted, that someone had buried the Lord.

The thought came to them that all would be clear if only the person in question could be made to give his testimony to the Resurrection. This thought of the doubting bystanders operated on one or more of the entranced witnesses as a suggestion, and to a perfectly true account of the Baptismal Christophany he appended the fiction that he spoke for Joseph of Arimathea.

The statement, after all, is only an instance of that impersonation by the subliminal self which is so frequent—*e.g.* in trance-mediumship or hypnotic experiment.

The same theory accounts for the soldiers. The doubters would be satisfied if only they had the statement of a soldier present at the Crucifixion. Finally, a witness more amenable to suggestion than the rest said he was a soldier, and could testify to the Resur-

rection because he had been posted to guard the tomb.

So, too, with the testimony of Phinees, Adas, and Haggai. Some of the bystanders began to think or say, "If only we had the evidence of Priests or Scribes we might believe." The suggestion operated as before: Galilean witnesses testified on behalf of Scribes.

The second part of the Gospel of Nicodemus is a result of the same process. Here the demand is to obtain testimony from the Underworld as to the reality of our Lord's Death. It is supplied by statements from two witnesses.

The interesting point in regard to these two witnesses is that their evidence appears to have been obtained in writing, even, as we should now say, by automatic writing. Someone took his pen in hand, probably to record some of the other statements, and (possibly himself becoming entranced) recorded the statement of one of the two witnesses. Such a process (whether accompanied or not by visual hallucinations) appears to lie behind the following statement (Walker, p. 207): "And after [the two witnesses] had finished all, writing on separate sheets of paper, they arose. And Karinus gave what he wrote into the hands of Annas, and Caiaphas, and Gamaliel: in like manner also Leucius gave what he wrote into the hands of Nicodemus and Joseph. And being suddenly transfigured, they became exceeding white and were seen no more. And their writings were found exactly the same, not one letter more or less."

III

Having accounted for the existence of these statements, we have next to ask ourselves how they came to appear in their present context. The solution is really exceedingly simple. It is only necessary to carry the process a little further.

Secondary personalities when formed are fairly stable. The "Guards," "Joseph," "Phinees," etc., or the "two witnesses from the dead," could always be summoned again and further interrogated. They could be asked one by one "what was the result of their action or their experience when it came to the knowledge of the Sanhedrin."

The guards say the Sanhedrin had bribed *them* to keep silence. Joseph says when the Sanhedrin got to know he had buried our Lord, they had put him in prison. Why, however, the questioner continued, was he not in prison now? Because, replied Joseph, our Lord had appeared to him at His Resurrection and set him free.

The result of the vision of Phinees, etc., upon the Sanhedrin was, that when they were informed of it they directed a search for Jesus. They failed to find Him. Was, however, their search entirely fruitless? No. "Jesus they had not found, but they had found Joseph." The last statement is an instance of the lack of originality which marks the subliminal consciousness.¹ It is simply a repetition of an idea

¹ For the lack of originality on the part of the subconsciousness see, *e.g.*, Mr Podmore's study (in *Modern Spiritulism*) of the

which had occurred earlier. At a previous point in the story the guards, when reproached for the empty tomb, reply, "Give us Joseph, and we will give you Jesus." So now the idea recurs. The search for Jesus ends in the discovery of Joseph. The discovery of Joseph in its turn must have had its effect. To the inquiry "What effect?" the reply is the despatch to him of a letter which brought him to Jerusalem, where he makes his statement regarding his miraculous release to the Sanhedrin. With what result? Phinees, Haggai, and Adas are summoned once again.

There is one interesting plot within a plot which not only illustrates further the lack of originality of the subconscious processes at work, but also supports my view of the Resurrection.

When the secondary personality of the proper witness is asked how the letter was delivered to Joseph, it simply follows the line of least resistance by applying to the case in hand the memories uppermost at the moment—the memories, that is to say, of the Christophanies.

We have already seen that there was a differentiation among the witnesses of the universal Christophany, and that Peter and six others had had a preliminary vision of the Galilean Lake. The vision had ended with the Eucharist upon the shore.

"inspirational" writing of mediums. Such writing is wonderfully facile, but never goes beyond the circle of optimistic platitudes which form the popular spiritualistic philosophy. Similarly, when M. Flourney's sensitive fabricates a Martian language, the construction and idioms of the language remain French.

Even after they had awakened from the vision and returned to Jerusalem, they had been for the next few days constantly seen in Galilee in company with the Risen Lord. No wonder, then, that their original visit to Galilee was accounted no vision but a reality, and that in attempts to describe their experience their physical return to Jerusalem after the John xxi. vision became postponed. They were thought to have gone into Galilee and remained there until, at the end of the Universal Christophanies, they were once more "found" at Jerusalem.

At Jerusalem, when all the Galilean visions were completed, the same seven were associated with others in the Eucharistic appearance in the Upper Chamber.

Thus, to put the proceedings in an abbreviated form, and to lay the stress, as, *e.g.*, Acts x. 41 does lay it, on the eating and drinking, the seven might be said to have sought our Lord in Galilee, to have eaten and drunk with Him there, and then to have returned to Jerusalem bringing Him back with them. There at Jerusalem, in company with others, they had eaten and drunk with Him yet again. This, however, is exactly the experience which the subconsciousness of the entranced witness selects as the model for the search for Joseph.

"They chose from all Israel seven men, friends of Joseph, whom also Joseph himself was acquainted with, and the rulers of the synagogue, and the priests and the Levites, saying to them: Take notice: if, after receiving our letter, he read it, know that he will come with you to us; but if he do not read it, know

that he is ill-disposed towards us. And having saluted him in peace, return to us. And having blessed the men they dismissed them. And the men came to Joseph, and did reverence to him, and said to him: Peace to thee. And he said: Peace to you, and to all the people of Israel! And they gave him the roll of the letter. And Joseph having received it, read the letter, and rolled it up, and blessed God and said: Blessed be the Lord God, who has delivered Israel, that they should not shed innocent blood; and blessed be the Lord, who sent out His angel, and covered me under his wings. And he set a table for them; *and they ate and drank and slept there.*

“And they rose up early and prayed. And Joseph saddled his ass and set out with the men; and they came to the holy city Jerusalem. And the people met Joseph, and cried out, Peace to thee in thy coming in! And he said to all the people: Peace to you! and he kissed them. And the people prayed with Joseph, and they were astonished at the sight of him. And Nicodemus received him into his house, and made a great feast, and called Annas and Caiaphas and the elders, and the priests and the Levites to his house. And they rejoiced, eating and drinking with Joseph; and after singing hymns, each proceeded to his own house. But Joseph remained in the house of Nicodemus.”

Thus I claim that the plot of these last chapters is exactly what the subconsciousness of the witnesses might elaborate, if subjected to further cross-examination, from the material of the statements already

produced. And also that analysis shows that the story presupposes just that account of the Resurrection which our examination of the New Testament seemed to justify.

IV

Let us now examine what remains of the three basal statements—the guard, Phinees and his companions, and Joseph.

The statement of the guard is valuable as showing, explained as I have explained it, the origin of the tradition of the guard in Matthew. Its details are not important; for, obviously, even if different from St Matthew's account at the outset, it would have been modified in the direction of the agreement. But the important thing is that the guard are mentioned as being five hundred in number.

With this should be compared the reading of one MS. of the report of Pilate (Walker, p. 230), which says that the dead saints brought from their graves (Matt. xxvii., 52, 53) numbered also five hundred.

The mention of five hundred as the number of the guard may have been produced by either or both of two tendencies.

The first, which, however, would come into operation somewhat later than the second, is this. St Matthew in his account of the appearance to the five hundred says, "but some doubted"—by which, on my theory, we would of course understand that their experience for the present was not a conscious one. At Pentecost, however, these doubts are re-

moved. To have doubts, however, is to be to some extent an unbeliever. And hence it might be said that up till Pentecost the five hundred were unbelieving and even hostile witnesses.

The second and earlier tendency is a continuance of the process of suggestion and response already indicated. Suppose the Pentecostal witness giving utterance to the fiction about the guard were interrogated as to its strength. Might he not regard the question as equivalent to another, "What was the number of your fellow-witnesses?" and reply "Five hundred"?

However, this mention of the five hundred in recension B¹ does not stand alone. There is another mention in a passage which we come now to examine.

V

The Phinees-Adas-Haggai narrative runs as follows :—

Greek Recension A.

We saw Jesus
and His disciples sitting on
the Mountain called Mamilch ;
and He said to His Disciples,
Go into all the world,
and preach to every creature ;
he that believeth and is
baptized shall be saved,
and he that believeth not
shall be condemned.
And these signs shall attend those
who have believed ; in My Name
they shall cast out demons,

B.

Jesus, whom you crucified, we have
seen in Galilee with His eleven
disciples upon the Mount of Olives,
teaching them and saying,
Go into all the world
and proclaim the good news ;
and whosoever will believe and be
baptized shall be saved,
but whosoever will not believe
shall be condemned.

¹ The reader should be reminded that recension B is *not* the version containing the Hebraisms. They appear in recension A.

speak new tongues, take up
 serpents: and if they drink
 any deadly thing it shall by no
 means hurt them; they shall
 lay hands on the sick and they
 shall be well.

And while Jesus was speaking to
 His disciples, we saw Him taken
 up into heaven.

And having thus spoken He
 went up into heaven.

*And both we and many others of the
 five hundred were looking on.*

The only point of interest in the Latin recension is, that the name of the Mountain is given as the "Mount of Olives, which is called Mambre, or Malech."

1. The name of the Mountain. The discrepancies fit in with my view that the mountain in Matt. xxviii. was unidentified, because symbolic. In this document I suggest that the original mentioned no mountain at all, but simply said our Lord was seen "on high" (*bimarim*). Of *bimarim*, Mambre is a corruption.

The other readings show attempts to substitute for the original *bimarim*, or the corruption Mambre, the names of various mountains; e.g., the Mount of the King, or the Mount of Olives.

There is, however, another possibility. Why should not the original form be that of recension B: "Jesus . . . we have seen in Galilee with His eleven disciples upon the Mount of Olives"? Galilee is the place where the witnesses were. The Mount of Olives (near Jerusalem) is where the Lord and the eleven were. In other words, the vision is seen at a distance—in fact, the idea of the universal vision is exactly the one we seemed to find in Acts.

2. The details of the vision need not concern us, because, as in the case of the experience of the guard, discrepancies with Scripture narratives would have been modified. In the text as we have it the predominant influence is obviously Mark-appendix, although, of course, the debt may be the other way.

3. Even the first form, which makes no mention of the five hundred, is nevertheless of great importance as corroborating my view of their experience. For if early Christians admitted it to be possible for outside witnesses, of whose presence at the scene the rest had been unaware, nevertheless to see our Lord surrounded by His Apostles, that view is proved. The idea that three men could be present without the eleven seeing them is only conceivable if the same fact was known to be true of others, *i.e.* if the five hundred were so many outside witnesses to the transactions between our Lord and the eleven.

Even then, if we had to regard the mention in B as an addition it would not greatly matter. The mention would be due to the reflection that if Phinees and his companions were present, then, *ipso facto*, they were members of the five hundred.

I believe myself that the mention of the five hundred is an authentic part of the original document. A theory of interpolation would have one great difficulty to contend with: the interpolation—if interpolation it be—occurs twice over. As we have seen, five hundred is also given as the number of the guards of the tomb.

That the double mention of the five hundred is in strictest accord with, at any rate, one line of tradition is shown by the Acts of Philip in Hellas. For there our Lord is prayed by Philip to appear before three hundred philosophers. Tidings of this intention are conveyed to the High Priest at Jerusalem, who gets himself with *five hundred armed followers* (i.e., of course, the five hundred soldiers of the guard) miraculously conveyed to the scene of the Christophany. Obviously, then, the early Christian imagination was exercised in devising means for the transference of the five hundred (more or less identified, as in the Gospel of Nicodemus, with the guard) from Jerusalem to the scene of the Galilean Christophany.

It is obvious that the mention of the five hundred at two apparently inconsistent places is quite sufficient to account for the omission of both mentions in recension A. Or again, if, as the Acts of Philip shows, the transportation of the five hundred was an idea adopted by Gnostics, an excision by Catholics of any statements favouring that idea was only to be expected.

We shall return to these passages later.

VI

We come now to the experience of Joseph. I have already alluded to it, but it is so important that I give the text (as found in recension A):—

“On the preparation, about the tenth hour, you locked me up, and I remained all the Sabbath. And

at midnight, as I was standing and praying, the room where you locked me in was hung up by the four corners, and I saw a light like lightning into my eyes. And I was afraid, and fell to the ground. And someone took me by the hand, and removed me from the place where I had fallen ; and moisture of water was poured from my head even to my feet, and a smell of perfumes came about my nostrils. And He wiped my face, and kissed me, and said to me, Fear not, Joseph ; open thine eyes and see who it is that speaks to thee. And looking up, I saw Jesus. And I trembled, and thought it was a phantom ; and I said the commandments, and He said them with me. Even so you are not ignorant that a phantom, if it meet anybody, and hear the commandments, takes to flight. And seeing that He said them with me, I said to Him, Rabbi Helias. And He said to me, I am not Helias. And I said to Him, Who art thou, my Lord ? And He said to me, I am Jesus, whose Body thou didst beg from Pilate ; and thou didst clothe Me with clean linen, and didst put a napkin on My face, and didst lay Me in thy new tomb, and didst roll a great stone to the door of the tomb. And I said to Him that was speaking with me, Show me the place where I laid Thee. And He carried me away, and showed me the place where I laid Him ; and the linen cloth was lying in it, and the napkin for His face. And I knew that it was Jesus. And He took me by the hand, and placed me, though the doors were locked, in the middle of my house, and said to me, Peace to thee. And He kissed me, and

said to me, For forty days go not forth out of thy house; for behold I go to My brethren into Galilee."

Recension B differs (1) in omitting what one might call the distinctively Semitic portion—the determination of the fact that our Lord was no phantom by the repetition of the commandments; (2) in omitting further the Baptismal part of the experience. Not only does the washing for the grave and the perfume disappear, but in place of the phrase "removed me from the place where I was lying" we have simply "raised me up." In both respects recension A will represent the original form. The repetition of the commandments is earlier than our Gospels, where proof of the reality of the Lord's body is given by the exhibition of the wounds. It is quite in accord with the process (doubts acting as suggestions) which presided over the production of these documents throughout; lastly, it contains the Hebraism *φύγει φεύγει*. The Baptismal experience is corroborated, as we have seen, by its agreement with St Paul's representation of Baptism as sympathetic sharing of Burial and Resurrection.

The Latin version is, generally speaking, as usual, a translation of recension A. But it substitutes for "wiped my face" "rubbed my face with the water itself as if washing me." Perhaps the alteration is intended to remove the difficulty of supposing that our Lord brought with Him so material an object as a cloth or towel.

As regards the Baptismal part of the Christophany,

I would refer the reader to my remarks above. The difficulties of the imprisonment of Joseph and the repetition of the commandments are, as has been remarked, accounted for by the naïve response of the subliminal self to suggestion. They by no means detract from the value of the narrative as a description of a Baptismal Christophany. The transportation to the tomb was a natural way for accounting for the vision of the tomb; and the placing of Joseph in his house though the doors were shut was exactly what, on my view that the Universal Christophany was an appearance to a number of scattered individuals wherever they might be, the early Church would assume to have occurred in the case of all witnesses alike: they had all been transported to the scene of their vision, and then redeposited at home.

In confirmation of this latter remark, we may adduce a Gnostic variation of Joseph's experience, the *Narratio Josephi*. Here, instead of being baptized and taken to the tomb, Joseph is taken into Galilee. The only interesting feature in the narrative is that we read, "in the middle of the feast of unleavened bread" John appeared. The statement follows on another to the effect that the journey into Galilee had taken three days. The feast of unleavened bread (Kirsopp Lake, p. 156) went on till Nisan 21, a week after the Crucifixion. The mention is quite in accordance with the view that the Galilean Christophanies of the five hundred took place during Easter week. And it must be compared with the statement in the Gospel

of Peter,¹ that during the whole of the Feast of Unleavened Bread the twelve were, as a matter of fact, in Jerusalem.

¹ The Gospel of Peter seems to regard the John xxi. vision or appearance to the twelve as occurring on the first Sunday after Easter. In so doing it makes a mistake that is complementary to Luke's. Luke puts the appearance to all the Apostles on Easterday instead of the Sunday following, and "Peter" puts the Lake appearance to the twelve on the first Sunday after Easter, instead of Easterday.

Part IV

THE ETHIOPIAN ACTS OF PETER. THE SYRIAC GOSPEL OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

THE FIVE HUNDRED DEFINITELY ASSOCIATED WITH PENTECOST—PENTECOST AS A REPETITION OF CHRISTOPHANIES.

A DOCUMENT about which very little is known is the Ethiopian Acts of Peter, translated by Dr E. Wallis Budge in his *Contendings of the Apostles*.

The book seems to be a sort of encyclopædia of narratives regarding Peter, formed by piecing together various works, orthodox and Gnostic.

The first two chapters are possibly in some respects the most important narratives of the Resurrection appearances which we possess. In the first place, they reproduce the list of Christophanies in 1 Cor. xv. 5 f. more closely than any other document. And, in the second place, they definitely connect the five hundred with Pentecost. Thirdly, they hint at the recovery of vision at Pentecost, and at the telepathic aspect of the phenomena.

Before, however, these invaluable chapters can be understood, it is necessary to make two preliminary observations.

1. *Combination of St Matthew and St Luke.*—We saw that St Luke gives us our best account of the appearance to the five hundred, tacitly and by implication, when he simply prolongs indefinitely the series of interviews at Jerusalem between our Lord and the Apostles. The inference from this multiplication of the appearances to the twelve and the Apostles was, as we saw, that the visions of the Galilean five hundred which were all the while taking place took the form of a group vision of the Apostles and their Lord. The scenes of these visions, according to Luke, would be, since the Apostles were all the time at Jerusalem, either the Upper Chamber or the Mount of Olives.

On the other hand, we saw that St Matthew combined all the similar and successive visions of the individuals who made up the five hundred into a single vision. And he located it, not at Jerusalem, where the Apostles were, but, the five hundred being really at their Galilean homes, at an imaginary mountain in Galilee.

Suppose now a tradition attempted to mediate between these two views; combining, that is to say, St Matthew's view that the appearance to the five hundred was a single appearance on a mountain, with St Luke's view that the scene of it was the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. Would not such a tradition inevitably seize upon the fact that the Ascension, with

which St Luke ends his narrative, and which took place upon the Mount of Olives, was the single mountain appearance to the five hundred of which it was in search?

If now the same tradition followed St Matthew in omitting the private and particular vision to the twelve, or in making it one with the vision of the five hundred, it would be thought that the twelve and the Apostles were summoned, after the appearance to Peter, not to the Upper Chamber but to the mountain direct.

2. *Continuation of the Acts-of-Pilate or Acts-of-Philip Mistake as to the Five Hundred.*—We have seen how, from the pseudonymous statements made by some of the five hundred on behalf of soldiers and hostile Jews, and also from the idea that the Pentecostal restoration of memories had been a banishing of doubts, the idea arose that *all* the five hundred were originally non-believers. The Acts of Peter perpetuates this notion.

Turn now to the narrative.

First (as we saw in I above he would be likely to do), our author assumes the twelve and all the Apostles brought to the Mount of Olives in the same way that they were brought to the Upper Chamber, that is to say, by a summons spreading over a wider and wider area. After an interview with the Risen Lord, "I cried out," says Peter, "to my brethren, that is to say, to James and John and Andrew, and they to the rest of the twelve Apostles and to the seventy-two."

Secondly, our author provides for our five hundred outside and hostile witnesses. "All the inhabitants of Jerusalem" see the cloud of light which surrounds the Apostles, and when Peter sees his vision "many also of the inhabitants of Jerusalem saw things which [he] was seeing."

Thirdly, our author brings these inhabitants of Jerusalem into definite relationship with our five hundred, and at the same time intimates the connection of that body with Pentecost, when he says that the "men of the Hebrews" who witnessed the Pentecostal miracles were "*more in number than five hundred men.*" They wished to fight,¹ but "by the mercy of God, God showed them a *vision* of the night."

Fourthly, although by his following St Matthew in combining all Christophanies in one, and by the further difficulty that the Ascension in Luke ends the Christophanies, he is precluded from including the Eucharistic appearances to James and all the Apostles—as *appearances*—he nevertheless alludes to them, and in the proper place—*between, that is to say, the appearance to the five hundred and Pentecost.* For, says he, "after three days [from the Ascension] James, whom our Lord called His brother after the flesh, offered the Eucharist, and all we [*sc.* all the Apostles] drew nigh to partake thereof.

Granted the two postulates which our author lays down for himself—the postulate (1) that the appearances to the twelve and the five hundred were one

¹ Presumably with the 200 heathen who are also Pentecostal witnesses.

single appearance taking place upon a mountain, and the postulate (2) that the five hundred were hostile Jews—it is difficult to see how he could have done better. For he has reproduced both of the two Pauline series of appearances, the appearances to Peter, the twelve, and the five hundred being succeeded by those to James and to all the Apostles. Above all he has represented *his* five hundred as taking exactly that part in the proceedings which was taken by the real five hundred, the Galilean believers. They are witnesses originally at a distance, and it is only at Pentecost that they become really witnesses at all.

II

We have now found four definite mentions of the five hundred. They agree in one very important particular: they always occur in a context which hints at the subliminal, because it hints at suggestibility. And the last mention directly corroborates the suspicion which we formed regarding the three others, that the suggestibility was evinced in connection with the Pentecostal phenomena.

Two allusions are in the Acts of Pilate. Statements, as we saw, were obtained pseudonymously from certain witnesses, who professed at the suggestion of doubting bystanders to testify on behalf of the enemy, *i.e.* the soldiers or the religious leaders of the people, and in the course of their statements the so-called soldiers or scribes mentioned the five hundred.

The third allusion—that of the Acts of Philip—

combines the two preceding ones. The five hundred whom the High Priest brings with him through the air are not exactly soldiers and not exactly scribes: they are armed Jews.

The fourth allusion is still more interesting. As we have just seen, Budge's Acts of Peter says the Hebrew witnesses *at Pentecost* were more than five hundred men, and the context shows that these Hebrews are not the Galilean brethren but the hostile inhabitants of Jerusalem. They are, in fact, the second of the two bodies of five hundred that appear in the Acts of Pilate, except that now the whole of the five hundred are hostile, as in the case of the guard. The only difference between the five hundred of the Acts of Peter and the five hundred of the Acts of Philip is that the former body are not armed.

Surely these four statements corroborate one another, and put beyond all doubt my theory of their origin in response to suggestion. In the Acts of Pilate we can see the process beginning. In the Acts of Peter we have it, as I say, definitely associated with Pentecost.

Surely, too, it is justifiable to go a stage further and say, in view of the continuance of trance memory, that the vision of the five hundred recovered from their subconsciousness had originally made its appeal to the same region of their being. And if, as is of course the case, St Paul is right in regarding the five hundred as really Christian believers, then it seems impossible to deny that the five hundred were the Galilean brethren, and that it was this subconscious

impression that brought them to Jerusalem, knowing not why until at Pentecost it re-emerged. One and all, like Phinees, Adas, and Haggai in the Acts of Pilate, *came up* from Galilee to Jerusalem.

III

But besides shedding light on the part played by the five hundred at Pentecost, the Acts of Peter sheds light on the nature of Pentecost itself. For it describes Peter as proceeding the day after Pentecost to the *Mount of Olives* in order to read certain books of mysteries which he had been given at the *Ascension*.

Could the relationship of Pentecost to the Christophanies be better described than by the return to the Mountain of Vision, and the reopening of the sealed books?

Returning then to the Mount of Olives, and opening the books, Peter sees first of all an angel, who gives him further particulars about the Resurrection, and then hears our Lord speak to him by a voice from heaven.

The symbolism of the books seems only one of two forms of the traditions. For, on pp. 469 and 474 Peter, at the Ascension, is told to "keep in his heart what he had seen," or "to open his eyes and look on certain mysteries," which, however, he is to be "strong to conceal." On the alternative view, the "mysteries" were not written in a book, but seen in a vision.

Whether, however, the relation of Christophany to Pentecost is described as the delivery of sealed books

which are afterwards opened, or as the seeing of a vision which is to be revealed only to the initiated, telepathy is indicated in both cases alike. For the books are studded with the *Magnetic Stone*. And as regards the vision, Peter's "*heart* is to become the means of ascent into heaven." It is clear that the document behind the Acts of Peter is Gnostic. Its Gnostic author, utilising the well-known fact that the visions seen at the Resurrection had re-emerged at Pentecost, has construed those visions as visions of heaven—visions embodying that "knowledge of supermundane reality" which was the Gnosis.

IV

It so happens that the tradition which makes Peter return to the Mount of Olives at Pentecost can be paralleled by another.

Rendel Harris's Syriac Gospel of the Twelve Apostles is a late work which may nevertheless be based on earlier material. And Rendel Harris himself thinks it quite possibly embodies parts of the Gnostic Gospel of the Twelve Apostles which was current in the second century.

Well, now, is it not in the highest degree significant that the account of Pentecost in the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles describes the twelve as proceeding *bound and called by the Holy Spirit to the Mount of Transfiguration*, where they spend seven days, until on the seventh our Lord provides them with tables laid with the "spiritual food wherewith He Himself is nourished"?

For we see here the very same account of Pentecost as in the Acts of Peter. In both alike Pentecost involves a return to a mountain. The only difference is that the Acts of Peter follows the Lucan tradition and makes the mountain the Mount of Olives, whereas the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles follows St Matthew and makes it "the mountain where our Lord had appointed them." The very words of St Matthew are recalled by our document: "They went whither Jesus had directed them."

That Pentecost was the repetition of the Christophanies, the emergence of the original impression, is shown not only by the return to the mountain, but by the week of prayer followed by a Eucharist. The events of Easter-week, the seven days of prayer, and the Eucharist with which they ended, are transferred bodily to the mountain of Matthew xxviii.

This passage from the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles should be compared with the passage from the Pistis Sophia with which we begin our next section.

For the very same transportation in defiance of time and space to a Galilean mountain, the very same mountain Eucharist, which, in the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, are described as occurring at Pentecost, are apparently in the Pistis Sophia Christophanic.

So that, from the standpoint of at any rate one school of Gnostic thought, the repetition of Christophanies at Pentecost in the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles would seem literally exact.

Part V

THE Gnostic APOCRYPHAL ACTS

JOURNEYS IN THE SPIRIT—PENTECOSTAL
VISIONS OF THE CHRISTOPHANY OF
MATT. xxviii. 16 f.

I

THE reader of the first part of my essay has no doubt perceived that the Resurrection appearances, if such as I have said, contained within themselves the seeds of the division of the Church into Orthodox and Gnostics.

Orthodoxy would lay stress on the concrete reality of our Lord's appearance in the Upper Chamber, and on whatever else favoured the idea of a Physical Resurrection. Gnosticism, on the other hand, would ask, Could a Real Body have appeared universally? Was it a Real Body that was seen in the Vision of the Lake? Or again, Gnosticism might ask, What are the metaphysical implications of the parts played in the drama by the various witnesses? If the twelve disciples really in Jerusalem were seen by witnesses in Galilee to be grouped about the Manifesting Lord,

or if the scattered members of the five hundred were nevertheless witnesses in quick succession of the same vision, did not that suggest new possibilities in nature and in man ?

The connection of Gnosticism with the transcendence of space in the Christophanies appears very clearly in the following sample of early Gnosticism. I quote from Lipsius' article " Pistis Sophia " in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*:—

" The fourth book, which is, alas, defective, has probably got by accident into the place where we now read it in the MS. It presents a simpler and older form of Gnostic doctrine.

" In the fourth book Jesus is described as standing, after His Resurrection, *at an altar on the shore of the ocean*, surrounded by His disciples, men and women *clothed in white linen raiment*. At His command retire to the left hand towards the West the Æons and the *σφαῖρα*, the Archontes with their *δυνάμεις*, and the *whole world*. Jesus and His disciples then take their place *in medio τόπω ἀερινῷ* on the way to the midst, underneath the *σφαῖρα*. He proceeds to instruct them concerning the significance and operations of the Archontes of the way of the midst, their binding by Jeu, and the tortures to which sinful souls are exposed from the five evil Archontes in the regions of the air, and also concerning the deliverance of the souls out of their power by the planetary spirits. At the prayer of the disciples that He would save them from these torments, *Jesus takes them to a mountain in Galilee*, while the Archontes

retire to their former place. Jesus bids them bring fire and branches of trees, and then amid mystic prayers *offers the Eucharist* (the *μυστήριον ἀληθείας βαπτίσματος*) for their atonement."

Omit the Gnostic jargon, and in the words italicised may be found an almost complete account of the Resurrection:—

1. The Baptismal side of the Universal Christophany appears in the clothing of men and women in white robes.

2. The Eucharist at the end of John xxi. may be traced in the altar on the shore of the ocean.

3. The transcendence of space in the Universal Christophany associated with the Galilean mountain appears in the "removing of the whole world" which precedes the transportation of disciples to the mountain in Galilee.

4. The Eucharist in the Upper Chamber is transplanted to the mountain, in exactly the same way as in the Gnostic Gospel of the Twelve Apostles.

If, however, Gnosticism was so interested in a one-sided interpretation of the Christophanies, that interpretation may be expected to play a prominent part in Gnostic literature. It is my object to show that to emphasise one side of the Christophanies—the visions, the transcendence of time and space—is in point of fact the main motive of those mysterious documents the Gnostic Apocryphal Acts. I should, however, add that such features might appear in works written long before Gnosticism became conscious of itself as

distinct from orthodoxy. So that, in particular cases it might be difficult to say whether a Gnostic writer was inventing legends, or appropriating what suited his purpose in legends already in existence.

II

DATE AND PREVALENCE OF THE GNOSTIC ACTS

"Gnostic Acts of Peter and Paul were certainly, Gnostic Acts of John were probably, read in the second century. From the fourth century we meet with distinct traces of *περιόδοι τῶν ἀποστόλων* widely diffused in Gnostic and Manichæan circles, which probably had the same compass from the beginning as Photius expressly testifies to us. According to him, it comprehended the Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, and Paul. This collection, which is attributed to Leucius Charinus, is considered to be a heretical fabrication by the unanimous decree of the Church teachers" (Lipsius, quoted by Mrs Lewis).

There is, moreover, apparently no reason why some of these Acts should not have been based on earlier material, whether oral or written. Thus in one place Lipsius says: "Though the Gnostic Acts of Peter and Andrew, and the Acts of Andrew and Matthias¹ so closely connected with them, cannot be referred to an earlier date than the third century, it seems certain that the legend or tradition which forms their groundwork must have been of much greater antiquity." And

¹ The Acts of Andrew and Matthias are examined in Appendix I.

again: "The foundation of these Acts [Andrew and Matthias] consisted in a *legend known in Jewish-Christian circles and probably already committed to writing.*"

That there was a fairly large early Christian literature outside the canonical books is indeed certain. "Besides these (διατάξεις or διαταγμαὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων, *Judicium Petri*, Ebionite περιόδοι Πέτρου), there were current during the second century several other works entitled the Preaching, Preachings, or Doctrine (κήρυγμα, κηρύγματα, or διδασκαλία) of Peter, Paul Thaddeus, Matthias, or James. To this class of writings belonged the Jewish-Christian κηρύγματα Πέτρου (groundwork of the first three books of Clementine Recognitions), the Catholic κήρυγμα Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου, the Gnostic παραδόσεις Ματθίου, and the Ebionite ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου."

It is significant, moreover, that "these from the first contained both didactic *and narrative* portions" (the italics are mine, here and in the next paragraphs).

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE Gnostic ACTS

Lipsius describes them as follows:—"There is withal a rich apparatus of the supernatural, consisting of visions, angelic appearances, voices from heaven, speaking animals, and demons who with shame confess their impotence against the champions of the truth; unearthly streams of light descend, or mysterious signs appear, from heaven; earthquakes, thunders, and lightnings terrify the ungodly; the elements of wind and fire and water minister to the righteous;

wild beasts, dogs and serpents, lions, bears and tigers, are tamed by a single word from the mouth of the Apostles, or turn their rage against the persecutors ; dying martyrs are accompanied by wreaths of light, or heavenly roses and lilies and enchanting odours, while the abyss opens to devour their enemies. The devil himself is often introduced in the form of a black Ethiopian, and plays a considerable part. *But the visionary element is the favourite one.* Our Lord often appears to His servants, now as a beautiful youth, and again as a seaman or in the form of an Apostle ; holy martyrs return to manifest themselves at one time to their disciples, at another to their enemies."

DIFFICULTIES OF CRITICISM OR INTERPRETATION

I quote again from Lipsius (following Mrs Lewis):—

"As early as the second century, numerous legendary reports concerning the fates of the Apostles were in circulation, in part, at least, of a very romantic character. Not a few of such narratives owe their origin simply to an endeavour to satisfy the pious curiosity or taste for the marvellous in members of the primitive Church ; while others subserved the local interests of particular times or districts which claimed to have derived their Christianity from the missionary activity of one of the Apostles, or their line of bishops from one immediately ordained by him. It likewise not infrequently happened that party spirit, theological or ecclesiastical, would take advantage of a pious credulity to further its ends by

manipulating the older legends or inventing others entirely new, after a carefully preconceived form and pattern. And so almost every fresh editor of such narratives, using that freedom which all antiquity was wont to allow itself in dealing with literary monuments, would recast the materials which lay before him, excluding whatever might not suit his theological point of view—dogmatic statements, for example, speeches, prayers, etc.—for which he would substitute other formulæ of his own composition; and further expanding or abridging after his own pleasure, as the immediate object which he had in view might dictate. *Only with the simply miraculous parts of the narrative was the case different.* These passed unaltered and unquestioned from one hand to another.

“Although, therefore, these fables originated for the most part in heretical quarters, we find them at a later period among the cherished possessions of ordinary Catholics.

“From all this it is clear that any comprehensive critical examination of the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles will have great difficulties to contend with.”

For my theory, the important points in this passage are: first, the statement that the Acts originated for the most part in heretical quarters; secondly, the statement that they were constantly being recast and modified in the interests either of theology or local tradition; thirdly, we can now add to the fact that “the visionary element is the favourite one” the fact that the miraculous portions of the Acts are compara-

tively constant. The last point is most important, for it suggests that our best hope of finding the true clue to the motives which produced the Acts will be by concentrating our attention on the predominant visions and the constant miracles.

HAVE THE ACTS AN HISTORICAL FOUNDATION?

Before attempting what may seem at first sight a rather fanciful interpretation of these Acts, it is needful to see if a straightforward one is impossible.

On this point Lipsius is absolutely clear: "All efforts to derive from them any trustworthy particulars as to the actual history of the Apostles themselves, or to extract from the mass of material any sound historical nucleus, have hitherto proved almost always unsuccessful."

What "genuine recollections have been preserved refer, with a few exceptions, not to the Apostolic legends themselves, but to their setting, to the pre-supposed secular historical background, to the geographical and ethnographical scenery, sometimes also to local forms of heathen worship."

III

The course of the argument on which we now enter will be as follows:—I shall first urge that a Christophanic motive is to be discerned in the common starting-point or basis of these Acts, the "*sortes apostolorum*." These Acts have been badly mutilated. Attempts to restore them are necessarily conjectural. Deferring, therefore, my own essays in

that direction to an Appendix, I shall adduce a parallel document which has come down to us in a better state, and which justifies my presumption as to the origin of the "sortes."

Whether, however, my theory of origins be approved or not, I shall show that these Acts contain passages which assume that at Pentecost a witness could fall into a trance, see a vision of the Lord surrounded by His Apostles, and be cognisant of the institution of Christian Baptism (Matt. xxviii. 16 f.).

IV

A COMMON PRESUPPOSITION

"The various Acts," says Lipsius, "are wont to take the traditional parting of the Apostles as their starting-point. This is the case with the *Acta Thomæ*, but also with the *Prochorus Acts* of John, Greek *Acts* of Andrew and Matthias, the *Acta Jacobi Zebedæi* in the Apostolic histories of Abdias, and with the Edessene legend of Thaddeus."

The tradition of the "*sortes apostolorum*" which is thus so universally presupposed describes the Apostles as casting lots for the cities of the world, and then departing severally to the city of their lot.

Now St Augustine—who ought to have known, being a converted Manichee—says that the Manichees (and, it may be presumed, the Gnostics before them) substituted the "*sortes apostolorum*" for the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit in Acts ii.

The idea of the "*sortes apostolorum*," however, is

no late development. On the contrary, it is quite obvious that it grew naturally out of the Pentecostal experience by a combination of two ideas.

1. It is based on the fact that at Pentecost the Christophanic visions were repeated. And the repetition, like the original visions, involved an apparent transcendence of space. The repetition was a repetition of an experience whereby the twelve were translated, as was thought, from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem to the Galilean Lake, and of a succeeding experience wherein the same twelve, really praying in the Upper Chamber at Jerusalem, were seen by witnesses in Galilee to be surrounding the Manifesting Lord.

If, however, the length and breadth of Palestine could be traversed in this way, why not the world? If Galilee had been covered in a week, why could not the world be covered in the weeks that followed?

2. The idea was helped by the phenomenon of speaking with tongues.

"Glossolalia" is not confined to one period of history. It occurs to this day; and it has lately been studied scientifically, especially in France.

First there is the type of ecstatic, incoherent utterance such as is quite common at revivals, etc., even nowadays. With it, quite conceivably, might be combined telepathy or clairvoyance. Ecstatic utterance coupled with telepathy between the entranced person and others is undoubtedly the right interpretation of the glossolalia known to St Paul.

A second type is the subliminal fabrication of a

language, *e.g.* the Martian language of Mme Hélène Smith. It is quite unlikely, however, that this tendency was exemplified in the early Church, except perhaps in a very rudimentary form.

The third type is more doubtful. The sub-consciousness is said to exhibit "hypermnnesia" in regard to speeches heard or passages written in some foreign tongue of which the waking personality is ignorant. Sometimes, too, the assertion is made that a medium "possessed" by a "control" speaks that control's language. The evidence, however, extends only to the utterance of a word here and there, except in the instance of a certain Madame X; and in her case the English critics suspect fraud.

There can be no reasonable doubt, therefore, that the Pentecostal glossolalia followed the first type. The gift of tongues was simply unintelligible ecstatic utterance.

It is quite certain, however, that though the words spoken were words of no real language, either of this world or another, those who heard them would assume (as they do nowadays) that the ecstatic was talking in some foreign tongue.

And they could not assume so much, with a knowledge of the transcendence of space at the Christophanies, without going farther.

Suppose an ecstatic at an assembly of Christians at Jerusalem speaking, as the bystanders imagined, in a foreign language, though the listeners were Jews. The Christians would simply apply to the case in hand their conception of what had happened at the

Resurrection appearances. Then, when his body was at Jerusalem, some more essential part of each of the twelve had "journeyed" into Galilee. Now, that same essential part of him had made a similar journey to some heathen land afar. Did you ask for proof of this? Why, his very lips were automatically repeating the sermon he had been delivering elsewhere, when, between Ascension and Pentecost, he had continued his spiritual excursions to some distant land.

So far from the "*sortes apostolorum*" being a later version of the tradition in Acts ii., the truth is the exact opposite. Acts ii. represents a later and rationalistic tradition, which finds it easier, instead of saying the twelve had visited foreign countries, to reverse the process and group representatives of all the languages upon earth about the Apostles. Or might one not even say that the tradition of Acts ii. grew out of the tradition of the "*sortes*," by implying that the spiritual journeys of the twelve among all nations during the period between the last of the Christophanies and Pentecost had had exactly the same effect upon the nations as their spiritual excursions during Easter week had had upon the Galilean five hundred? Representatives, that is to say, of all the nations had flocked to Jerusalem just as the five hundred had flocked to Jerusalem.

The "*sortes apostolorum*" may possibly be traced in Matt. xxviii. 19, "Go ye and teach all nations," and in Mark's appendix, xvi. 15, "Go ye into all the world." Still more striking is Westcott and Hort's

alternative ending to Mark, where the preaching of the Apostles (no doubt alike in Galilee and among the nations) is actually substituted for an account of the Christophanies. And the effect of the theory continues even to the time of Eusebius, who implies that a mysterious propagation of the Christian faith among the Gentiles had *preceded* the conversion of Cornelius.

The date attributed to the "sortes" would fit this view. For in spite of the Clementine Recognitions, Apollonius (quoted by Eusebius), and the preaching of Peter and Paul, we have other authorities—the Gnostic Acts of Thomas, the Prochorus Acts of John, the Syriac Doctrine of the Apostles, and Budge's Ethiopian Acts of Peter (p. 475)—which represent the Apostles as casting lots immediately after the Ascension.

V

The best proof that the Gnostic Acts originated in the supposition that the spiritual excursions of Easter week among the Galileans had been continued over a yet wider area, would be to show in detail that the general structure of the narratives was Christophanic.

That, in spite of the mutilation to which the Acts have been subjected, can still, to some extent, be done. Thus Peter—in transcendence of space¹—proceeds to the city of his lot by walking upon the waves; and Peter, as we saw, had walked upon the

¹ "The whole country was folded up before me like a piece of paper."

waves in the earliest tradition of the vision of the twelve.

A proof still more complete could be furnished in the case of Andrew. For in the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, Andrew proceeds to the City of the Man-eaters in a spiritual ship—the boat, in fact, of John xxi. —which performs the journey in an incredibly short time. As this boat reaches the shore, two disciples of Andrew have their souls taken from their bodies, and see—all unknown to Andrew, though as the result of his prayers—our Lord surrounded by the twelve. In other words, they participate in the Universal Vision. Lastly, it can even plausibly be maintained (see Appendix) that the author proceeds to effect an enumeration of the five hundred, whom he regards as participating in an experience connected with an Apostolic gathering on a distant mountain.

But besides the direct proof there is an indirect one that is even more striking. It is contained in the legends of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary.

There is little doubt that these legends originated in the same circles as the Gnostic Acts. That was the early opinion regarding them. And it is supported by intrinsic considerations—for instance, by the partiality shown by the authors for miraculous transportations. No doubt the legends are later than the earlier Apocryphal Acts. But if they really originated in the same heretical circles, it is surely extremely likely that the writers would be acquainted with the esoteric meaning of the Gnostic Acts.

The thesis to be proved is that the narrative of the

Apostolic journeys is based upon the fact that while the various Apostles were seen by various witnesses at various places, they were really in the Upper Chamber at Jerusalem. The proof of the thesis is that the very same fact is asserted of the Virgin Mary.

On page 49 of Mrs Lewis's version of the *Transitus Mariæ* (*Studia Sinaitica*, No. xi.) there is to be found the account of some spiritual excursions of the Virgin Mary, which are accompanied by a series of seven miracles; while at the end of the narrative it is distinctly stated, "*And while the Lady Mary was doing these miracles in Rome and in all these countries; all the Apostles were with her in Jerusalem.*"

"People without number, both men and women, believe much in her, since the Governor who was in Jerusalem came up and narrated how she helps the souls who call on her and believe. Often here in Rome she appears to the people who confess her in prayers, for she has appeared here on the sea when it was troubled and raised itself, and was going to destroy the ship in which they were sailing. And the sailors called on the name of the Lady Mary, and said: 'O Lady Mary, mother of God, have mercy on us!' And straightway she rose upon them like the sun and delivered the ships ninety-two of them, and rescued them from destruction; and none of them perished.

"And again she appeared by day on a mountain, where robbers had fallen upon people and sought to slay them. And these people cried out, saying,

‘O Lady Mary, mother of God, have mercy on us!’ And she appeared before them like a flash of lightning, and blinded the eyes of the robbers, and they were not seen by them; and there was no destruction to them.

“And she appeared here to a widow woman whose son had gone and peeped into a well of water; and he fell into it; and there was no one near him to lift him up; and the woman wailed at the mouth of the well; and she said, ‘O Lady Mary, Mother of God, have mercy upon us!’ And straightway the Lady Mary appeared to her, and snatched up the boy, who was not choked, and she gave him to his mother.

“And she appeared here in Rome to a certain man who had been sick for sixteen years; and there were no doctors who could help him in anything all these long years. Then he took a censer and cast incense into it, and remembered the Blessed One, and said, ‘O Lady Mary, Mother of God, cure me,’ and immediately she came to him and cured him; and she sent him to the Church of Rome before the whole people.

“And again she appeared when a ship had been wrecked, and many people who were in it had fallen into the sea. And the Lady Mary appeared running upon the waves of the sea, and she carried the souls of the people who had fallen to the dry land, and she rescued many so that they did not perish.

“And again she appeared to two women in the land of Egypt, as they were going along the road, and a great snake came out against them; and it ran

after them to devour them. And they called upon the name of the Blessed Lady Mary. Then the Lady Mary appeared to them, and struck the snake on its mouth, and it split in two, and these women were delivered and did not perish.

“And again she appeared here to a certain merchant man who had borrowed 1000 dinars and had gone to trade with them in another place. And he was going on the road, and his purse fell from him, and was lost. And after he had gone a long distance he was sitting down to eat bread. And he changed his garments, and sought for the purse, and did not find it. And he wept and wailed and went in the way praying and saying, ‘O Lady Mary, have mercy upon me!’ Then the Lady Mary had mercy upon him, and led him, and made him stand over the purse of dinars, and he took up his own, and had lost nothing from it.

“And while the Lady Mary was doing these miracles in Rome and in all these countries; all the Apostles were with her in Jerusalem.”

The very fact that the number of miracles is seven hints that I am right in supposing that the manifestations to the five hundred which took place while the twelve were praying in the Upper Chamber lasted exactly a week.

VI

It is really unnecessary to lay very great stress on the general motive of the Gnostic Acts; for, after all, the transportations only prove that time and space were transcended in the Christophanies. And that is

quite satisfactorily proved by the contradictions as to the scene of the appearances in the Canonical Gospels.

But what I do wish to prove—and it seems to me far more important—is that the writers of these Acts had a view of Pentecost very like our own. *They associated Pentecost with a trance-condition in which the witness saw over again the Universal Christophanic vision.*

VII

DESCRIPTION OF THE VISION ITSELF

The most important, because the least mutilated, version of the Universal Vision as recovered in trance is the vision of Menelaus in Mrs Lewis's "Story of John" (Lewis, p. 163; *cf.* Wright, p. 23). The following is the text of the vision:—

"I saw angels without number, and they had wings: they covered their faces with some of their wings, that they might not see the Creator. And with some they covered their feet: and with some they flew, and said, 'Holy, Holy, Holy is the Mighty Lord, with whose praise heaven and earth is full!'

"And I saw twelve men in one place; and in another place seventy men, and they were gazing up into heaven.

"And I saw the right hand of a man coming out from among the angels like unto fire,[and] commanding them to go out and baptize the people in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, and whoso believeth shall live for ever.

"And whilst I was above, I trembled with fear,[and]

I said unto those seventy apostles, 'Who is that?' And they said unto me: 'That is the Son of God, whom the Jews crucified in Jerusalem, and all that thou hast seen—He is its King: for He is the Power and Wisdom of God. And He it was who sent Him into the world, that He might draw men unto His Father.'

"And I saw twelve disciples; and I saw this John with them, and he was clothed in shining glorious raiment, and he stood among the foremost of them, clinging to an old man. And the twelve were looking at him lovingly. And his eyes were gazing up to heaven, and he was weeping. And the old man drew nigh to him and said unto him, 'Why weepest thou, O my son?' And he returned him an answer, saying, 'Because of the of the city of Ephesus.' And I asked what was the name of the old man? And they said unto me, 'This is Simon Cephas.'

"And I saw also fingers which made a sign to him, with a voice saying unto him, 'All which thou hast asked of Me, I have accepted it from thee; and I have answered thee about it.'

"And while I was terrified I knew that it was he whom I had wished to slay, because he had reproved me for fornication. Then I heard his voice; and I came down to him; and lo! I am standing beside you; and I entreat him to bring me near to the truth. And ye are they who have seen this wonder. And do ye return from your error and put away the idols from you; and come that we may be his disciples, and our souls may be saved; and we will trust and

believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost henceforth and always and for ever and ever. Amen."

On this passage I make the following brief notes :—

1. The conventional supermundane symbolism with which it begins is not necessarily a later addition. Such an element in the very texture of the visions may be the true origin of the belief in the Ascension.

The mention of the witness as "above" during the vision, and as descending later, supports our suggestion that the Mount Mambre of the Acts of Pilate represents an original "bimarim."

2. The time to which the vision takes its percipient back is shown, alike by the "gazing into heaven" (Acts i. 10) and by the Baptismal Institution (Matt. xxviii. 19), to be the time of the Resurrection appearances.

3. The Baptismal Right Hand shows a true recollection of the fact that Baptism was instituted by an experience, and that that experience included the being raised from the earth by the Lord's Right Hand.¹

4. The special part played by Peter and John

¹ Compare the description of our Lord's own baptism: "When this Jesus was baptized and multitudes surrounded Him, the heavens were rent. And His Father cried out over Him, and *pointed Him out with the finger*, saying, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I take pleasure: hear ye Him" (Wright, p. 34). Hence perhaps Irenæus: "After stating that the ten commandments were written with the Finger of God, Irenæus [in his newly discovered treatise] remarks, 'But *the Finger of God is that which is stretched out by the Father to the Holy Spirit*'" (*Guardian* for 20th September 1908).

occurs in another vision (Lewis, p. 7), and is in accord with John xxi. In the Acts of Thaddeus, Peter and John are given as the names of the two disciples of Mark's appendix. John's weeping is a common feature in the Apocryphal Acts (Lewis, pp. 38 and 162; Budge, p. 492); Rev. v. 4 is probably in recollection of it. Its real cause, no doubt, was our Lord's departure (Budge, p. 469: "We *all* wept, and said, 'Leave us not orphans'").

5. With regard to our Lord's answer to John's prayers, "All which thou hast asked of me, I have accepted it from thee"—here, too, there are parallels.

Thus in Budge's Acts of Peter (p. 507), Peter is weeping; and a woman addresses him, "O aged man, *weep not; thou hast found that which thou wast seeking.*"

Again, in the Acts of Philip in Hellas, Philip is confused with John, even to the degree of being called a son of Thunder. In the presence of the 500 companions of Ananias (a confusion, as we have seen, of the five hundred witnesses and the guard at the tomb), "a voice out of heaven was brought to Philip, 'O Philip, son of Thunder, but now of meekness, *whatsoever thou mayest ask of My Father He will give it thee.*'"

The probability is, that from the fact that the five-hundred vision was dependent on the prayers of the twelve arose the idea that our Lord had conferred on the prayers of the twelve peculiar efficacy. The conferring of the power of absolution in the Fourth Gospel has probably the same origin: only those saw the Lord for whom the Apostles had made supplication.

A SHORTER VERSION OF THE VISION

The following is from Mrs Gibson's Preaching of Peter, pp. 58, 59:—

"When I was snatched away, I journeyed to the further end of heaven; and when I went before the Throne of Glory, the old man [Peter] was standing there doing homage, and the legions of angels standing by. And the Lord said from His throne, 'Let the desire of Peter, the Captain of My Church, be fulfilled.' And at the voice my soul returned to my body."

VIII

Context of the Visions.—The context of the first vision is simple. A young man, Menelaus, is put to death by John for committing a certain sin. In death he sees the vision. And when John has raised him from the dead, he gets John's permission to recount it.

In other words, the vision is a vision seen in death-like trance.

The context of the second vision is much the same, except that, instead of Menelaus, the witness is the Emperor's son, and he has died a natural death.

The writers then undoubtedly believed that it was possible for a witness to fall into a trance, in which—if we take the Menelaus narrative as the norm of the experience—he went back as it were into the past, and beheld *the original Universal Vision, that in which Baptism was instituted.*

Moreover—and this is really the crucial point of

the evidence—in either case the events are associated with Pentecost.

In the immediate context of the Petrine vision we have Pentecost transferred to Rome—a great cloud and stormy *wind* destroying the idols; *fire* coming out of darkness at Peter's prayer. And then tidings are brought that the Emperor's son is dead.

Before the Menelaus vision, John is described as stripped by the soldiery. They find upon him a cross of wood; "and when they stretched out their hands to take it away, it had four *tongues of fire*, and they burned the hands of those who came near it."

Wide Prevalence of the Vision.—It would be easy to show that these visions are no isolated exceptions. The vision of Menelaus does not stand alone, except in the fact that it has escaped more than others the hand of the editor. Indications of visions seen in exactly similar circumstances are to be found in almost all the earlier types of Gnostic Acts. The visions have been modified, but some traces of a vision remain in the Acts of Andrew (Lewis, p. 7) and Paul (Budge, p. 671).

Perhaps the plainest proof of the extent to which the Menelaus vision dominated the whole controversy between Gnostics and orthodox¹ is to be derived

¹ I use these terms for the present for the sake of convenience. But when I finally sum up my evidence I shall show that originally the parties to the controversy were exactly reversed. It was the orthodox Jewish Christians, the witnesses of the vision, and their friends and successors who believed in it. It was the Ebionites who treated it with scorn.

from the Acts of Thomas. For a short analysis of the book will easily show that you have in each episode in turn, either an attempt of the Gnostics to bring in the vision, or an attempt of the orthodox to ridicule it.

To the first class belong Acts two, three, and six. Gad, the king's brother, dies, and sees a palace being built for his brother in heaven. A youth is killed by a snake, and sees himself in a vision committed to Thomas by our Lord. A murdered girl sees first a vision of hell (possibly an anti-Gnostic travesty of the vision of heaven), and then she too sees herself entrusted to Thomas.

The tendency to parody the Menelaus vision appears most clearly in the fourth Act, where an ass dies, like Menelaus, and Thomas refuses to restore it because "it is better so." In the seventh Act, as we shall see later, a whole herd of asses are brought in to point the ridicule not at one Pentecostal witness but at all. And in the first Act there is a blasphemous parody of the Baptismal Right Hand. Compare Part VI. Chapter VI. below, also Appendix II.

(That the attack on Gnosticism is deliberate appears in the fifth Act, where the power of appearing in two forms is attributed, not, as was the Gnostic belief, to the Risen Lord, but to demons.)

In the Acts of Thomas, then, whether believers in the vision are telling their own story, or their opponents are interpolating that story with their travesties and parodies, the controversy centres in the Menelaus Vision.

Visions of Christ seen at Repetitions of Pentecost not by One Individual but by Crowds.—On p. 613 of Budge's Acts of Paul, Paul and Philip return to Lystra, and find the unbelievers gathered together outside the city. "God sends a mighty tumult upon the multitude through the prayers of the two chosen Apostles." They are converted, and tell their companions in the city; "and they all went out to the river bank, and they found *the pure Apostles, and our Lord sitting among them with His angels.*"

Here, then, we have the usual repetition of Pentecost, and what seems to be an abbreviated version of our Menelaus vision seen by a crowd.

There is reason to think (Appendix I.) that the Paul and Philip episodes are really imitated from some earlier document where the protagonist was Andrew. But be that as it may, the passage corroborates the two passages from the Acts of John and the Acts of Peter, and seems to show that in Gnostic circles a tradition was preserved embodying the theory of Pentecost for which I have been pleading.

Lastly, in Appendix I. we have a similar vision occurring in a context Christophanic rather than Pentecostal. See also Appendix II.¹

¹ A comparison of p. 85 (last paragraph but one) and p. 51 (first paragraph) hints that the transportation of the five hundred in the Acts of Philip is borrowed from the still earlier Gnostic Acts of John.

Part VI

THE CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS

THE OBJECT OF THE SPIRITUAL EXCURSIONS IS TO BRING THE FIVE HUNDRED TO PENTECOST.

IN the last part we tried to show that the Gnostic Apocryphal Acts are based on the presumption that the Apostles assembled in the Upper Chamber had made spiritual excursions among the Galilean brethren.

We tried to show also that the authors of these Acts believed that a Pentecostal witness went back, as it were, in time and saw the Universal Christophanic vision of our Lord surrounded by the Apostles.

Of course, if one grants, with the Acts of Peter, that the witnesses at Pentecost were the five hundred, then it is obvious that the result of the spiritual excursions was the assembling of the five hundred. But it so happens that I can call testimony to prove that such was the belief.

For I can show that certain early Christians strenuously maintained that the five hundred were not assembled in this way.

But if, as I shall show, the Ebionites—for those are the controversialists in question—maintained that the five hundred were not assembled by visions of the twelve, or by spiritual excursions of the twelve, but by *quite ordinary means*, that proves that *the view which the Ebionites combat existed*.

I find the proof I require in the first books of the Clementine Recognitions, which is believed to contain Ebionite *περιόδοι* of Peter. And the theory which I apply to explain the work (the reasons for which appear in the following extracts) is this. Peter represents the conception of that Apostle which the Ebionites accepted, Simon Magus the conception which they impugned. And the whole plot is intended to exalt the Ebionite or preaching Peter over Simon Magus, his wonder-working counterpart.

I

To support my view that the Clementines are meant to deny that side of the Christophanies on which the Gnostics laid stress, I would adduce, in the first place, the three following passages, which show that at least one point in dispute was the value of Simon's visions:—

(a) On p. 233 of the Recognitions (Clark's translation) there is an argument between Peter and Simon on the question of visions, in the course of which Simon asserts, and Peter denies, that (as we should now say) telepathic or clairvoyant visions are possible.

“To this Simon answered: ‘Apply your mind to those things which I am going to say, and cause it,

walking in peaceable paths, to attain those things which I shall demonstrate. Listen now, therefore. Did you never in thought reach forth your mind into regions or islands situated far away, and remain so fixed in them that you could not even see the people who were before you, or know where yourself were sitting, by reason of the delighfulness of those things whereon you were gazing ?’

“ And Peter said : ‘ It is true, Simon, this has often occurred to me.’ Then Simon said : ‘ In this way now reach forth your sense into heaven, yea, above the heaven, and behold that there must be some place beyond the world, in which there is neither heaven nor earth, and where no shadow of these things produceth darkness, and consequently, since there are neither bodies in it, nor darkness occasioned by bodies, there must of necessity be immense light ; and consider of what sort that light must be which is never succeeded by darkness. For if the light of this sun fills the whole world, how great do you suppose that bodiless and infinite light to be ? So great, doubtless, that this light of the sun would seem to be darkness in comparison.’

“ When Simon thus spoke, Peter answered : ‘ Now, listen patiently concerning both these matters—that is, concerning the example of stretching out the senses, and concerning the immensity of light. I know that I myself, O Simon, have sometimes in thought extended my sense, as you say, into regions and islands situated afar off, and have seen them with my mind not less than if it had been with my eyes. When I

was at Capernaum, occupied in the taking of fishes, and sat upon a rock, holding in my hand a hook attached to a line, and fitted for deceiving the fishes, I was so absorbed that I did not feel a fish adhering to it, while my mind eagerly ran through my beloved Jerusalem, to which I had frequently gone up waking, for the sake of offering and prayers. But I was accustomed also to admire this Cæsarea, hearing of it from others and longing to see it; and I seemed to myself to see it, although I had never been in it; and I thought of it what was suitable to the thought of a great city, its gates, walls, baths, streets, lanes, markets, and the like, in accordance with what I had seen in other cities; and to such an extent was I delighted with the intentness of such inspection that, as you say, I neither saw one who was present and standing by me, nor knew where myself were sitting.' Then said Simon: 'Now you say well.'

"Then Peter: 'In short, when I did not perceive, through the occupation of my mind, that I had caught a very large fish which was attached to the hook, and that although it was dragging the hook from my hand, my brother Andrew, who was sitting by me, seeing me in a reverie and almost ready to fall, thrusting his elbow into my side as if he would awaken me from sleep, said, 'Do you not see, Peter, what a large fish you have caught? Are you out of your senses that you are thus in a stupor of astonishment? Tell me what is the matter with you?' But I was angry with him for a little, because he had withdrawn me from the delight of those things which

I was contemplating. Then I answered that I was not suffering from any malady, but that I was mentally gazing on the beloved Jerusalem, and at the same time on Cæsarea ; and that while I was indeed with him in the body, in my mind I was wholly carried away thither. But he, I know not where inspired, uttered a hidden and a secret word of truth.

“ ‘Give over,’ says he, ‘O Peter. What is it that you are doing? For those who are beginning to be possessed with a demon, or to be disturbed in their minds, begin in this way. They are first carried away by fairies to some pleasant and delightful things, then they are poured out in vain and ford motions towards things which have no existence.’

“ ‘In short, that you may receive the faith of the matter: concerning Jerusalem, which I had often seen, I told my brother what places and gatherings of people I had seemed to myself to see. But also concerning Cæsarea, which I had never seen, I nevertheless contended that it was such as I had conceived it in my mind and thought. But when I came thither and saw nothing at all like to those things which I had seen in phantasy, I blamed myself, and observed distinctly that I had assigned to it gates and walls and buildings from others which I had seen, taking the likeness in reality from others. Nor indeed can anyone imagine anything new, and of which no form has ever existed. For even if anyone should fashion from his imagination bulls with five heads, he only forms them with five heads out of those which he has

seen with one head. And you therefore now, if truly you seem to yourself to perceive anything with your thought and to look above the heavens, there is no doubt but that you imagine them from those things which you see, placed as you are upon the earth. But if you think that there is easy access to your mind above the heavens, and that you are able to conceive the things there, and to apprehend knowledge of that immense light, I think that for him who can comprehend these things it were easier to throw his sense which knows how to ascend thither into the head and breast of someone of us who stand by, and to tell what thoughts he is cherishing in his breast. If therefore you can declare the thoughts of the heart of anyone of us who is not pre-engaged in your favour, we shall perhaps be able to believe you, that you are able to know these things that are above the heavens, although these are much loftier.'"

Cf. pp. 224-5, where there is a shorter form of the same argument.

(*b*) In the *Homilies*, pp. 266 f., the discussion turns on Simon's claim "to know more satisfactorily the doctrines of Jesus" than Peter did, because he "heard His words through an apparition." On p. 267 Simon claims that visions and dreams being God-sent do not speak falsely in regard to those matters which they wish to tell.

Peter, on the other hand, explains that revelation "is knowledge gained without instruction, and without apparitions and dreams. The statements of wrath are made through visions and dreams, but the

statements to a friend are made face to face in [outward] appearance, and not through riddles and visions and dreams as to an adversary. If, then, our Jesus appeared to you in a vision, made Himself known to you and spoke to you, it was as one who is enraged with an adversary, and this is the reason why it was through visions and dreams and through revelations that were from without that he spoke to you. But can anyone be rendered fit for instructions through apparitions? And if you will say it is possible, then I will ask, 'Why did our teacher abide and discourse a whole year to those who were awake?'"

This is important as showing that the visions of Simon, of which Peter questions the value, though he does not deny the occurrence, were visions of *the Risen Lord*.

A third passage is even more important.

(c) In the Recognitions Peter admits the fact that some such vision of glory as is said to have been seen by the Christophany witnesses alike in the Acts of Peter, Acts of John, Acts of Andrew and Matthias, *was actually seen*, but attributes it to Satanic agency. At least so I would interpret the following passage (Recognitions, p. 203):—

"The most of men have been made enemies to God. . . . But of the rest, who seemed for a time to be watchful, the enemy, appearing in a phantasy of glory and splendour, and promising them great and mighty things, has caused their mind and heart to wander away from God."

II

It will be remembered that the Christophanic vision in the Acts of John was seen by a young man Menelaus whom John had put to death, and that traces of a vision seen in death can be found throughout the Gnostic Apocryphal Acts.

Now I cannot but think that to bring this vision of the dead youth into contempt is the motive of the passages on pp. 200-2 and 262 of the Recognitions. Simon is said to owe all his magic to the *soul of a murdered boy*. And when Simon asks Peter about the immortality of the soul, Peter refers him to "the image in his bedchamber, containing the figure of a *murdered boy clothed in purple*."

III

Not only are the miracles performed by Simon Magus exactly the miracles performed by various Apostles in the Apocryphal Acts, but the great miracle, that of flying through the air, is exactly the one which, as we see, for instance, in the Dormitio Mariæ, was attributed to Peter. See Simon's vaunt, Recognitions, p. 263; *cf.* p. 197:—

"I am the first power, who am always and without beginning. But having entered the womb of Rachel, I was born of her as a man, that I might be visible to men. I have flown through the air; I have been mixed with fire, and been made one body with it; I have made statues to move; I have animated lifeless things; I have made stones bread; *I have*

flown from mountain to mountain; I have moved from place to place, upheld by angels' hands, and have lighted on the earth. Not only have I done such things, but even now I am able to do them, that by facts I may prove to all that I am the Son of God enduring to eternity, and that I can make those who believe in me endure in like manner for ever."

Cf. Actus Petri cum Simone, Lipsius, pp. 48 and 49, where the narrative describes Simon as reaching Rome by flying through the air—like Peter and the other apostles in the Dormitio Mariæ.

The important thing in the Recognitions is that (p. 266) it is *admitted* that Simon's vaunt is true.

Nicetas says, "Indeed he told no lie in his declaration of what he has done."

IV

But there is another long passage which is even more important. The author of the Clementines, or more probably of the Ebionitic *περιόδοι* of Peter, which is here incorporated into the story, is not content with denying the validity of the Christophanic visions and the transportations of the Gnostics; he attempts a narrative of his own, in which his own view of the Christophanies is set forth in order.

The facts he has to account for are (as I have already shown) as follows:—Our Lord appeared first to the twelve, whom He sent to Jerusalem; then to the five hundred, who were also sent to Jerusalem. But before the whole number got there our Lord appeared to the twelve and certain others—the

appearance being that to "all the Apostles." Lastly, when the rest of the five hundred had got to Jerusalem, came Pentecost

The author of the Recognitions or *περιόδοι* describes all these happenings in the narrative of the sequel to the defeat of Simon in a dispute with Peter at Cæsarea. He uses Cæsarea to represent the place of the appearance to the twelve; Tripolis to represent Jerusalem, the place of the final rendezvous of all witnesses, and the scene alike of the appearance to all the Apostles and of the descent of the Spirit on the five hundred at Pentecost. The intervening places—Dora, Ptolemais, Tyre, Sidon, and Berytus—are then available to indicate the various places at which our Lord had appeared to the various members of the five hundred before despatching them to the rendezvous (Jerusalem, or, as we have seen, Tripolis).

The first step in constructing a fiction of this nature is to find a substitute for the Manifesting Lord. The obvious substitute is Peter.

The next step is for Peter to have an interview with twelve persons (=our Lord's appearance to the twelve), and then to despatch the twelve persons to Jerusalem (Tripolis). This is done as follows:—
(a) News is received that Simon has fled to "pre-occupy the ears of the Gentiles." As a matter of fact, Simon goes over the same course as Peter does after him. This is our author's way of telling us that all the various Christophany witnesses were said to have seen some sort of vision, which, however, he would regard as delusive. (b) Peter determines it is

necessary to follow on Simon's track. As, however, he himself is detained, by the need of preaching the word, for three months at Cæsarea, he sends twelve men before him. He has already in his entourage twelve men: Zaccheus, Sophonius, Joseph, Michæus, Eleazar, Phinees, Lazarus, Eliseus, Clement, Nicodemus, Nicetas, and Aquila. But it is very important, in view of the sequel, to notice that he does not send these as they stand. He first substitutes for the new converts Clement, Nicetas, and Aquila, and for Zaccheus, who is to stay behind at Cæsarea, four others.

Thus we get *Stage I. Farewell Speech of Peter to the Twelve* (=our Lord's appearance to the twelve).—"While the twelve stood around him, he addressed us."

Stage II.—The whole course—Dora, Ptolemais, Tyre, Sidon, Berytus to Tripolis—is then traversed (1) by the twelve, and (2) by Peter as representing the Manifesting Lord. Thus our author acknowledges that the various members of the five hundred did, as a matter of fact, seem to be visited by the twelve and the Manifesting Lord, although he insists that the twelve were physically present, and that the two parts of the experience (visit of the twelve, visit of the Lord) were distinct.

After the twelve have gone, and he has preached for the three months in Cæsarea, Peter goes to Dora. The whole progress, and the way in which all the converts accompany Peter right on to Tripolis, is described as follows (Recognitions, p. 282):—

"Having set out from Cæsarea on the way to Tripolis, we made our first stoppage at a small town called Dora, because it was not far distant; and almost all those who had believed through the preaching of Peter could scarcely bear to be separated from him, but walked along with us, again and again gazing upon him, again and again embracing him, until we came to the inn.

"On the following day we came to Ptolemais, where we stayed ten days; and when a considerable number had received the word of God, we signified to some of them who seemed particularly attentive, and wished to detain us longer for the sake of instruction, that they might, if so disposed, follow us to Tripolis. We acted in the same way at Tyre and Sidon and Berytus, and announced to those who desired to hear further discourses that we were to spend the winter at Tripolis. Therefore, as all those who were anxious followed Peter from each city, we were a great number of elect ones when we entered into Tripolis. On our arrival, the brethren who had been sent before met us before the gates of the city, and, taking us under their charge, conducted us to the various lodgings which they had prepared. Then there arose a commotion in the city, and a great assemblage of persons desirous to see Peter."

Here, then, quite obviously we have a rationalised account of the arrival of the witnesses to the Universal Christophany at Tripolis=Jerusalem. The twelve=the twelve apostles. Peter gathering together a continually increasing crowd in Cæsarea, Dora, Ptolemais,

THE CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS

THE CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS

THE CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS

Tyre, Sidon, and Berytus=our Lord visiting all the cities and villages of Galilee, and bringing the five hundred to Jerusalem. At the same time, the writer makes every now and again a criticism on the established tradition. For instance, in his parting speech at Cæsarea he has a sly hit at the idea that they left wives and children, etc. Also he hints at the difficulty of getting lodgings for so many. Thus, p. 283 :—

“When we had come to the house of Maro, in which preparation had been made for Peter, he turned to the crowd and told them that he would address them the day after to-morrow. Therefore the brethren who had been sent before assigned lodgings to all who had come with us. Then when Peter had entered into the house of Maro, and was asked to partake of food, he answered that he would by no means do so until he had ascertained whether all those who had accompanied him were provided with lodgings. Then he learned from the brethren who had been sent before, that the citizens had received them not only hospitably, but with kindness, by reason of their love towards Peter. . . . Even if many more had come, there would still have been a deficiency of guests for the hosts, not of hosts for the guests.”

Stage III. Appearance to all the Apostles.—“Thereupon Peter was greatly delighted, and praised the brethren, and blessed them, and requested them to remain with him. Then when he had bathed in the sea and had taken food he went to sleep in the evening; and visiting as usual at cock-crow while the evening light was still burning, he found us all awake.

Now there were in all sixteen of us: Peter and I, Clement, Niceta, and Aquila, and those twelve who had preceded us saluting us. Then, as was his wont, Peter said: 'Since we are not taken up with others to-day, let us be taken up with ourselves. I shall tell you what happened at Cæsarea after your departure, and you shall tell me of the doings of Simon here.'"

We now see the reason why Clement, Niceta, and Aquila were first separated from the twelve. It was in order that when the reunion at Tripolis was effected we might get the group "all the Apostles." The words "since we are not taken up with others to-day, let us be taken up with ourselves," are intended to emphasise the fact that the final appearance at Jerusalem was to the official group.

But why is it that the author says only four persons had to be added to the twelve in order to complete the larger group of "all the Apostles"? "All the Apostles" really seem to have been seventy persons. Why does our author say they were sixteen?

The answer is that he falls very nearly into the same very natural mistake as the author of the Fourth Gospel, in thinking that "all the Apostles" in the official list of appearances (preserved for us by St Paul) means the whole number of the twelve. Four is the difference between eleven (the number of the twelve original Apostles without Judas) and seven (the number of the participants in the vision of the Galilean Lake, which was, as we have seen, what St Paul means by the appearance to the twelve). The tradition behind the Clementines simply put the number four in the

wrong place. Instead of saying that four had to be added to seven in order that the witnesses of the Vision of the Lake could, together with the other members of the twelve, be present in Jerusalem on Easter night, the tradition says that four had to be added to the twelve to make them the group of "all the Apostles" to which our Lord appeared on the Sunday following.

Stage IV. Pentecost.—At daybreak Peter is informed that "Simon has fled, and that the crowds thought that the day which was to intervene was a very long day for their affection, and that they were standing in impatience before the gate, conversing among themselves about those things which they wished to hear, and that they hoped that they should by all means see him before the time appointed, and that as the day became lighter the multitude were increasing, and that they were trusting confidently, whatever they might be presuming upon, that they should hear a discourse from him. . . .

"Then Peter, filled with admiration, said: ' . . . You see, brethren, how every word of the Lord spoken prophetically is fulfilled. The desire, therefore, of hearing the word of God and inquiring into His will, they have from God: and this is the beginning of the gift of God, which is given to the Gentiles, that by this they may be able to receive the doctrine of truth.' "

Here, then, are all the marks of Pentecost: the mysterious expectancy—the beginning of the gift of God—and the fulfilment of prophecy.

After another chapter of discourse from Peter, Peter (p. 286) continues: "'Enough has been said of

these things ; for time presses, and the religious devotion of the people invites us to address them.' And when he had thus spoken, he asked where there was a suitable place for discussion."

What follows is most important. It shows that the writer was fully aware of the tradition (see Acts of Peter) that the witnesses at Pentecost were more in number than five hundred—in other words, that Pentecost was the restoration of Christophanic memories—although he is dissatisfied with the idea that *only* the five hundred were concerned.

"And Maro said: 'I have a very spacious hall which can hold *more than five hundred men*, and there is also a garden within the house; or, if it please you to be in some public place, all would prefer it, for there is nobody who does not desire at least to see your face.' Then Peter said: 'Show me the hall or the garden.' And when he had seen the hall, he went in to see the garden also; and suddenly the whole multitude, as if someone had called them, rushed into the house, and thence broke through into the garden, where Peter was already standing, seeking a fit place for the discussion.

"But when he saw that the crowds had, like the waters of a great river, poured over the narrow passage, he mounted upon a pillar which happened to stand near the wall of the garden, and first saluted the people in a religious manner. But *some of those who were present and who had been for a long time distressed by demons, threw themselves on the ground*, while the unclean spirits entreated that they might be allowed

but for one day to remain in the bodies that they had taken possession of. But Peter rebuked them, and commanded them to depart, and they went out without delay."

Can anyone doubt the author's motive? He represents the trance and ecstasy of the Pentecostal witnesses as *pathological*; they are possessed by demons.

Peter then cures sick folk, and preaches a sermon.

V

It will thus be seen that the writer of the Clementines corroborates my theory completely, except on two points. The vision to the twelve; the fact that the five hundred saw the twelve; the fact that the experience of the five hundred was a vision (for Simon the magician and vision-monger visits them before Peter and the twelve); the reunion at Jerusalem first of all the Apostles, to whom the Lord appears, then of the five hundred, on whom at Pentecost the Spirit descends—all my points are corroborated, with two exceptions: (1) the John xxi. vision, (2) the fact that at Pentecost the memory of the Christophanies was revoked. I now proceed to show that even on these points our author shows traces of acquaintance with the real facts.

1. *John xxi.*—It will be remembered that the whole train of events begins with the intimation that Simon has fled. The following passage describes the bringing of the news to Peter:—

"When Peter was thus speaking the day dawned; and behold one of the disciples of Simon came crying

out: I beseech thee, O Peter, receive me, a wretch who have been deceived by Simon the Magician. . . . When he went out from here I followed him. . . . But when he saw me following him (John xxi.) he called me blessed, and led me to his house. And about the middle of the night he said to me: I shall make you better than all men, if you will remain with me till the end (Matt. xxviii.). When I had promised this, he demanded of me an oath of perseverance; and having got this, he placed upon my shoulders some of his polluted and accursed secret things that I might carry them, and ordered me to follow him. But when we came to the sea he went on board a boat which happened to be there, and took from my neck what he had ordered me to carry. And as he came out a little after, bringing nothing with him, he must have thrown it into the sea."

Here, then, we have a parody of the Baptism of Peter as we reconstructed it from John xxi. And be it noted that just as our author allows the (delusive) visions of the five hundred to have preceded the preaching of the twelve and Peter, so he admits that a knowledge of these nefarious proceedings of Simon preceded the farewell instructions of Peter to the twelve.¹

2. *Recrudescence of Memories at Pentecost.*—The revival of memories is obviously the butt of our writer's sarcasm, when the twelve say to Peter before their

¹ It is perhaps hardly necessary to point out how strong a corroboration of the view that the Christophany of John xxi. was baptismal is afforded by the deposit of Simon's burden in the sea.

departure, "We shall always retain in our hearts *the remembrance of thy face*" (p. 278).

VI

With this passage in the Clementines compare the seventh Act of Judas Thomas (Wright, p. 200).

It is entitled "The seventh Act, how Judas Thomas was called by the General of King Mazdai to heal his wife and daughter."

A. The general comes to Thomas and tells his tale. The wife and daughter have on their return from a banquet been attacked by two demons—"a man and another like him."

It is quite obvious that the demon and the other like him are a reappearance of the Simon Magus idea. For Thomas himself is supposed to be always accompanied by the Lord, to whom he bears an exact resemblance. Just then as Peter was preceded by Simon Magus, so Thomas does not visit the general's house until after his Satanic double.

B. Thomas sets out with the general on his chariot.

It will be remembered that in the Recognitions passage the group of "all the Apostles" is provided by adding to the twelve *four* others.

The selection of four persons from the number of the five hundred is represented by the statement that the general is made by Thomas to approach a herd of wild asses, and take four of their number and harness them to the chariot. "The general went fearing greatly, because they were many; and the more he went on [the more] they came towards him.

And when they were close to him, he said to them : Judas Thomas, the Apostle of Jesus the Messiah saith : Let four of you come to me, because I require them. And when they heard this speech, all the asses came to him with a great rush ; and when they came to him, they bowed down unto him by the direction of our Lord " (the resemblances to the rush of people into the hall in Tripolis capable of holding more than five hundred men is obvious).

C. The devils are cast out and deliver speeches. So does one of the asses. In other words, the Pentecostal phenomena are first described as pathological, the work of demons, and then an attempt is made to ridicule in particular the gift of tongues.

D. Knowledge of the fact that Pentecost was the repetition or recollection of the Christophanies is hinted at in the speech of the general when the four asses have been yoked to the chariot : " I am not able to speak and to tell what is happening, but let there be another wonder and then I will tell."

The ridicule of Pentecost by the story of the speaking ass reappears on Budge, pp. 443 f. (Wright, pp. 179 f.). The ass speaks to the Apostle, who finally consents to ride on him. When they arrive at the city he dismounts, saying to the ass, " Go, and take heed where thou goest." " Straightway," like Mene-laüs before John, " the ass's colt fell down before them and died. And all those who were there were terrified, and said unto the Apostle, Bring him to life and raise him up again. Then the Apostle answered and said unto them, I have the power to raise him

up through the might of Jesus Christ, but *he is better thus* : and He who gave him a voice to speak with is able to make him not to die, and to raise him up again, *but He wisheth it not. This state is best for him.* And the Apostle commanded those who were standing there to dig a hole and bury the body of the colt of the ass."

In the first Act of Thomas we have an attempt to ridicule the Menelaus vision which is positively blasphemous. For, when one considers the important part which visions in death play in the story, it is fairly obvious that the appearance at the feast of a black dog bearing the right hand of the cup-bearer who has insulted Thomas and gone to the fountain to draw water is—since black dogs are invariably Satanic—an attempt to parody the Baptismal Right Hand of the death-vision of Menelaus.¹ We have thus discussed here or on page 81 all the first seven of the Syrian Acts of Thomas except one, the fifth. That describes the exorcising of a demon who can appear

¹ For another parody of the right hand, see Walker, p. 513. Mary is being carried out to burial. "A certain well-born Hebrew, Jephonias by name, put his hands upon the couch ; and, behold, an angel of the Lord, by invisible power, with a sword of fire cut off his two hands from the shoulders, and made them *hang above the couch lifted up in the air.*" To these instances of parody should be added, no doubt, Budge's Acts of Paul, p. 62 : "Seest thou not this great and exalted young man who is crowned with a crown of gold, and round whom the governors are standing? He is the *son of the King* of Medon, and the other who is standing on his right hand is his chief councillor, and the minister of his power." The young man in question is *Satan*, who had come to the city "with *many devils*" !

either as a young man or an old (Wright, p. 183); in other words, it is a parody of a common Gnostic notion regarding our Lord (appearing, *e.g.*, in Lipsius's *Acta Johannis*, p. 194).

A rather pretty Gnostic rejoinder to such parodies of the Baptismal Right Hand is to be found in Mrs Gibson's *Martyrdom of Clement* (*Studia Sinaitica*, v. p. 48): the saint sees a vision of a lamb lifting its right *foot* and pointing to the earth; by digging in the place indicated, water is discovered.

VII

I now add a few remarks on the importance of the negative argument.

A. The attempts at ridicule are widespread. The main examples, of course, are the parodies (just examined) of the gathering together of the five hundred at Pentecost, and the subsequent phenomena in book iv. of the Clementines, and the seventh Act of Judas Thomas. But travesties—sometimes of the Christophanies, sometimes of Pentecost—are also to be detected in the Acts of John and Peter and Thomas.

The very extent of the attack, and the obvious ignorance of many of the writers as to the real tendency of the legends they repeat, shows that the controversy to which we are carried back is a very early one.

B. Still more significant is it that the parodies occur in the Clementines. For the Clementines are beyond doubt based on Jewish-Christian literature.

Part of their sources are the Ebionite Circuits of Peter. The long and important passage on which I laid such stress is probably an excerpt from that work. What follows? This: in these attacks on the Resurrection happenings we have attempts made *in sub-apostolic times* to defeat the true history of the Christophanies and Pentecost *on Jewish soil, that is to say, exactly where we should expect the recollection of the experience of the five hundred to have survived.*

C. The attacks, be it observed, take a double form. *On the one hand*, we have ridicule of the Menelaus *trance-vision*. See, for instance, the allusions to Simon's murdered boy in the Clementines, the ass which is left to die "because it is better so" in the Acts of Thomas, the right hand carried off by a dog in the same work. *On the other hand*, we find ridicule of the proceedings of *Pentecost* as pathological, or of the witnesses at Pentecost as a herd of asses (Clementines, Acts of Thomas). It seems a just conclusion that the Menelaus vision is an early description of the Pentecostal experience, else why do the same people (surely the single ass and the herd of asses come from one and the same source) ridicule alike Pentecost and the seeing of the Menelaus vision in trance?¹

¹ I give my own view of the rest of the Recognitions—it is professedly tentative—in Appendix II. chap. iv.

Appendix I

THE CHRISTOPHANIC MOTIVE IN THE ACTS OF ANDREW AND MATTHIAS

By way of showing that it can be at least plausibly maintained that one at any rate of the Apocryphal Acts is Christophanic, I add the following notes upon the Acts of Andrew and Matthias among the Maneaters.

I. A CHRISTOPHANY WITHIN A CHRISTOPHANY

The outer Christophany is, of course, a Christophany in a boat. Andrew goes with two disciples to the rescue of Matthias, who is in prison among the Maneaters. Our Lord provides a spiritual ship, and Himself acts as pilot. The transcendence of space in the Galilean Christophanies is indicated by the fact that the spiritual ship makes the journey in a miraculously short time—three days.

The inner Christophany is a vision not unlike the Mene-laos vision.

“Father Andrew, do not think that we knew when thou wast speaking with Him in the boat, for we were weighed down by a most heavy sleep ; and eagles came down out of the heavens, and lifted up our souls, and took them away into the Paradise in heaven, and we saw great wonders. For we beheld our Lord Jesus sitting on a throne of glory, and all the angels round about Him. We beheld also

Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the saints ; and David praised Him with a song upon his harp. And we beheld there you the twelve Apostles standing by in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, outside of you, twelve angels round about you, and each angel standing behind each of you, and they were like you in appearance. And we heard the Lord saying to the angels, 'Listen to the Apostles in all things whatsoever they shall ask you.' These are the things which we have seen, Father Andrew, until thou didst awake us ; and angels who appeared like eagles brought our souls into our bodies."

The grafting of the inner upon the outer Christophany is described as follows :—

"And when the boat was about to come near the land, Jesus bent down His head upon one of His angels, and was quiet. And Andrew ceased speaking ; and he also, reclining his head upon one of his disciples, fell asleep. And Jesus said to His angels : 'Spread your hands under him, and carry Andrew and his disciples, and go and put them outside of the city of the Maneaters ; and having laid them on the ground, return to Me.' And the angels did as Jesus commanded them ; and the angels returned to Jesus, and He went up into the heavens with His angels.

"And when it was morning, Andrew, having awakened and looked up, found himself sitting on the ground ; and having looked, he saw his disciples sleeping on the ground, and said to them : 'Rise up, my children, and know the great dispensation that has happened to us, and learn that the Lord was with us in the boat, and we knew Him not ; for He transformed Himself as if He were a pilot in the boat, and humbled Himself, and appeared to us as a man, putting us to the test.' And Andrew, recovering himself, said : 'Lord, I recognised Thy excellent words, but Thou

didst not manifest Thyself to me, and because of this I did not know Thee.’

“And his disciples answered and said to him . . .” [the vision is recounted]. Then, at Andrew’s prayer, our Lord appears to Andrew.

There is another version of the same story, so far as relates to the spiritual ship and the miraculous transportation, in chapter xi. of Budge’s Acts of Paul. The voyagers, instead of Andrew and two disciples, are Paul and Philip.

“After these things the two Apostles departed from the city of Lystra by night, and they came to the seashore seeking for a ship which might convey them to the city of Iconium by night. And they found the Lord there, for *He had gone before them and had made ready a ship for them*, and He sat therein in the guise of a master of the ship. . . . And when the two Apostles had embarked in the ship, they straightway lay down and slept, and when they awoke in the morning they found themselves on the sea-shore of Iconium while they were still asleep.”

Notice the words in italics. For it will be remembered that in the Gospels great stress is laid upon the fact that after the Resurrection our Lord will *go before* the disciples into Galilee. Here, then, the going before is associated with the provision of a spiritual ship and a magic transportation. In other words, the writer has at the back of his mind the thought of a journey, not to the city of the Maneaters, but to Galilee. That being so, we shall not be surprised to meet at the next stage of the story our old acquaintances the Galilean five hundred.

II. COMPLETION OF THE PLOT

We have seen then, so far, that the context of vision B is an attempt to bring that vision—the vision of two of the

five hundred—into relationship with the boat Christophany of John xxi.

Let us now follow the story a little farther, dividing our remarks under three heads and a conclusion.

1. *The Acts of Andrew and Matthias contain an enumeration of the five hundred.*

The sequel of our vision B is briefly as follows :—

Andrew releases from prison (besides, of course, Matthias) 270 men and 49 women. He also releases from imminent death at the hands of the Maneaters 217 old men. But besides these persons, the 7 guards of the prison have fallen down dead at Andrew's prayer, and have been protected by a miracle just as the Maneaters were about to devour them.

Let us examine the possibility which naturally suggests itself that these various figures are connected with St Paul's five hundred.

The distinction between the old men and the other larger group might well correspond to a distinction between those of the five hundred who came up to Jerusalem not knowing why (and whose spiritual faculties might accordingly be presumed to be blunted) and those whose faculties were shown to be keen because at Pentecost it transpired that they had seen a vision.

And the 7 guards might represent the series of witnesses (guards at the tomb and other enemies) whose evidence was adduced in the way we have already seen in our study of the Acts of Pilate. Obviously, too, if the vision seen by the 2 witnesses in the boat was the vision of the five hundred, we have, if we would arrive at the sum of the five hundred, to add them to the rest. Our total will then be $270 + 49 + 217 + 7 + 2 = 545$.

Now it so happens that this is exactly the number we might arrive at for the five hundred by quite another line of

reasoning. It would seem not unlikely that in assigning periods to the manifestations of the Risen Lord, Gnostics and perhaps others followed blindly the number of persons to whom He manifested Himself. Thus the Pistis Sophia says He appeared—there being eleven Apostles—for eleven years. Conversely, Hermas seems to think there were forty Apostles because our Lord appeared for forty days. Well, the Valentinians thought our Lord appeared for eighteen months. And the Ascension of Isaiah actually gives the period as 545 days. In other words, if the figures are based, as seems likely, on the number of the five hundred, the Acts of Andrew and Matthias on the one hand, and the Valentinians and the author of the Ascension of Isaiah on the other, agree that the exact number of the five hundred was 545.

There is yet another proof. It will be remembered that in the Acts of Philip in Hellas, Ananias the High Priest is miraculously transported to the scene of the Christophany with five hundred companions. Now there is a variant on this miracle in Wright's Acts of Philip. It is transferred to a boat upon the sea. And the 500 companions are represented by a statement that there were 495 spectators in the ship. The question then arises, Why exactly are 495 substituted for 500? And I suggest that the author has subtracted from the total number of the five hundred (= as we have seen, 545) the number of the women in the Andrew and Matthias Acts = 49. The result (496) will be Ananias and his 495 companions.

2. *The five hundred are not only enumerated, they are described as split up into two divisions, to one of which Andrew makes a definite promise of return.*

The 270 men and 49 women are sent to a place apart. First Andrew cures them of blindness, and then he says,

"Rise up and go into the lower parts of the city, and you shall find in the way a great fig-tree, and sit under the fig-tree *until I come to you*. But if I delay in coming, you will find abundance of fruit for yourselves ; for the fruit shall not fail from the fig-tree, but according as you eat, it shall produce more fruit and nourish you as the Lord said."

3. Meanwhile, however, a previous step had been taken. Before despatching those of the five hundred whom he had cured of blindness to the magic fig-tree, *Andrew despatches Matthias and the two disciples of the boat upon clouds to the mountain where Peter was teaching*. And to that same mountain, according to the Acts of Peter and Andrew, Andrew himself finally repairs.

Thus the story possesses a centre of gravity outside the proceedings proper—a mysterious mountain in the distance, to which Apostles are to betake themselves.

CONCLUSION

The whole point of the story seems to lie in the contrast between the mountain where Peter is teaching and the fig-tree beneath which those of the five hundred who have been cured of blindness are told to abide.

In other words, if by the Maneaters we understand the Galileans, the whole emphasis is laid on the contrast between the local situation of the Galilean five hundred and the Mount of Olives, on which in a vision they saw, or were thought to have seen, the Lord surrounded by the Apostles.

It may be that the author supposed the reader sufficiently acquainted with Christophanic history not only to recognise the Galilean five hundred in his 545, but also to know that the experience of the five hundred was a vision of the happenings upon Peter's mountain. In that case he would find it hardly necessary to describe Andrew's return.

On the other hand, he may have described it. We have already seen that in the Ethiopian Acts of Paul one Paul-and-Philip narrative is founded on an Andrew narrative. Is it not also possible to discern a second voyage of Andrew to the Maneaters in a second visit of Paul and Philip to Lystra? If so, it is significant that the repetition of the visit is accompanied with a "mighty tumult"—a repetition, in fact, of Pentecost—and also a vision of "our Lord and His angels" (Budge, pp. 611 f.).¹

A second visit of Andrew and a vision seen in this way would of course be a complete proof of my theory of Pentecost. But of course it cannot be demonstrated that the Acts of Paul is really following an Andrew source. I content myself, therefore, with urging that my theory of the Universal Christophany, at any rate, is supported by the obvious connection between the mountain and the tree. For that connection shows that the theory of the Universal Christophany held by the author of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias was the theory which we have attributed to Luke, and which we saw was possibly indicated in the Gospel of Nicodemus, recension B, where it says that witnesses in Galilee saw our Lord and His Apostles upon the Mount of Olives.

¹ See page 81 above.

Appendix II

A PENTECOSTAL EPISODE IN THE ACTS OF PAUL

I

THE Gnostic Acts of Peter have in their original purity been lost, but the following extract gives us indirect evidence of the sort of material they contained.

Chapter xv. of Budge's Acts of Paul represents the transference of a Petrine narrative to Paul. This is most distinctly indicated for us by the writer himself. For he begins by describing an interview between the two Apostles. Peter asks Paul to tell the story. And Paul's first words are: "O man, who art fit for the instructing of the men of the world in the faith of God, when I had separated myself from thee there came unto me whilst I was asleep *the angel who used to come to thee.*"

The Gnostic writer, it is transparently obvious, has had an idea, or two ideas. Narratives about St Peter have become hopelessly discredited. As regards St Peter, orthodoxy or Ebionism has driven the Gnostic romances out of the field.

One idea of the author of our passage is to take a favourite incident from his discredited Acts of Peter, and see if he can win acceptance for it by ascribing it to Paul. And

the other idea is at first sight similar. The Virgin Mary seems to a superficial view to be substituted quite arbitrarily for the Manifesting Lord. But I shall try to show later that the substitution has an esoteric meaning.

Two other preliminary remarks are necessary:—

1. Matt. xiv. 23 f. being, as we saw, a part of the original John xxi. tradition, it is obvious that there must have been a tradition of our Lord's appearing (as in fact the Martyrium Matthæi says he did appear), not upon the shore, but upon the sea.

2. The narrative of our Lord's appearing to Peter as he fled from Rome (*e.g.* in Budge, p. 34) is obviously a mere repetition of the original Christophany to Peter. Either the fleeing of Peter represents the fact that when our Lord appeared to Him he was fleeing, not from Rome, but from Jerusalem, or, as is even more probable, it is an echo of the terror of Peter as he sank beneath the waves.

We may now approach our narrative.

When Mary appears to Paul, standing upon the waves, with the words "Whither fleest thou?" we are carried back to a tradition of the appearance of our Lord to Peter. It is true that Paul is represented as standing himself upon the shore, instead of upon the sea; but, of course, we cannot expect our author to do such a violence to legend as to attribute to Paul absolutely everything that had been asserted of Peter.

The interesting thing is the sequel. After the appearance of Mary, there are successive arrivals of huge crowds of people—enemies in search of Paul—in boats. As each boat approaches, Paul is told to take up water, sprinkle it in the air, and so baptize the voyagers.

This baptizing by water sprinkled in the air is most undoubtedly Petrine. For in Lewis's Martyrdom of Peter,

p. 216, we read: "When Peter saw that he could not baptize the people altogether, he took some of that water and sprinkled it upon them. And on whomsoever a particle or drop of that water fell he was baptized."

The successive crowds of people who approach Paul will thus be the successive arrivals of Peter's fellow-witnesses on the far shore of the Galilean Lake.

The three boats may possibly be due to theological tendency—the reference being to Baptism in the Triple Name. Be that as it may, the numbers of the persons in the boats indicate that the tradition has in view not only the twelve or some of them, but also the five hundred. Besides which, the designation of the arrivals as enemies is in line with the traditions already examined in Parts III. and IV., according to which the five hundred were hostile witnesses. A more important question is this. *When Paul (or Peter) sprinkles water on the people in the boats, what happens?*

"Now when they had drawn nigh and seen me, they all bowed down before me, and said unto me with one mouth, 'Peace be unto thee, O Saint Paul, the Apostle of our Lord who became man!' And they held converse among themselves, and said: 'Hasten, O ye who are gathered together, that ye may see the wonders of God who became man!' Then they said unto me, 'O Saint Paul, didst thou see that which we saw as we were sailing in the boats before we came to thee?' And I said unto them, 'What did you see, O new children?' And they said unto me, 'We saw the gates of heaven opened, and a *right hand which was like unto a flame of fire* reached forth from heaven upon us with thy right hand; and we saw a woman of light whose face shone with a radiance which was seven times brighter than the light of the sun, and she rose up from the

bottom of a cloud of water from which thou wast sprinkling us, and she embraced us with her arms, and she saluted us, and set upon our heads crowns of light.'"

Except that the Baptismal Right Hand is assigned to the Virgin Mary, the resemblance to the Menelaus vision is complete.

Here, then, we have, as in the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, the vision of the five hundred and the twelve, the two differentiations of the Universal Christophany, brought into line. And the machinery is equally ingenious. The author of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias has emphasised the transcendence of time and space by making the two members of the five hundred see the Lord and the Apostles in heaven, while both Lord and Apostle had been a moment before in the boat; while the author of the Pauline narrative has emphasised the large number of the witnesses by bringing them to Paul instead of obliging Paul to travel to them (*cf.* the Acts ii. version of the "sortes apostolorum").

Not only the sprinkling itself, but also its apocalyptic results, can be paralleled from the Martyrdom of Peter (Lewis, p. 211). For before Peter sets out to walk upon the waves to Rome, he is told by the Lord: "Go now, and tell whomsoever thou wilt of the dead to arise in My Name, and likewise do thou *sprinkle the eyes of the blind that they may see*, and they will obey thee. And wheresoever thy voice shall fall, thence shall issue My mercy."

II

And now we come to the point the decision upon which we deferred. We said that the substitution of the Virgin Mary for the Manifesting Lord had an esoteric meaning. That meaning is that by the Mother of the Light and our Lady we are not really meant to understand the Virgin Mary at

all. According to certain Gnostics, our Lord's mother was the *Holy Spirit*.

For a proof of this belief one has only to refer to the fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Of our Lord's Baptism it is said, "The whole Fountain of the Holy Spirit descended and rested on Him, and said to Him, My Son" Of the immediately succeeding temptation it is said, "My mother the Holy Ghost took Me by one of My hairs, and carried Me to the great mountain Tabor."¹

If, then, the mention of our Lord's mother in the passage we are discussing is really a reference to the Holy Spirit, all becomes clear. To associate the Virgin Mary with Baptism is very strange. To associate the Holy Spirit with Baptism is not only natural, but, as we have seen, can be paralleled from a Gnostic account of the Baptism of our Lord. Grant, however, that our Lord's mother is here not the Virgin Mary but the Holy Spirit, and it is not only possible to assign to the passage a much earlier date than on the opposite supposition, but it is also possible to bring it into direct relationship with the other narratives of the Gnostic Acts. For here, just as in the passages quoted in Part V. from the Acts of John, Peter, and Paul, you have the several Apostles producing a repetition of Pentecost at the city which he visits.

In the present case we have not only a repetition of Pentecost, but one that materially strengthens our evidence. We have the Menelaus vision with its Baptismal Right Hand seen, as in the episode connected with Paul and Philip, not by one man but by a multitude. And we have,

¹ It is significant that Ezek. viii., which was in the mind of the writer, resembles our passage in the Acts of Paul: "He put forth the *form of a hand*, and took me by a lock of mine head."

as in the Acts of Peter and the Acts of Pilate, the percipients of the Pentecostal vision described as foes.

III

It was urged in the last section of this essay that the best proof of the early date of the Menelaus vision was the wide extent of attempts at parody.

The representation in the passage just examined of the Baptismal Right Hand of the Menelaus vision as belonging to our Lord's mother, the Holy Spirit, enables us to find one more parody of that vision in the Domna (?=Domina) in the Prochorus Acts of John. Domna is *keeper of the bath*. Domna, instead of sprinkling water on men's eyes and so illuminating them, flings gravel at John and blinds him. Compare, too, a later development in the Acts of Andrew and Bartholomew (Budge, p. 191). The wife of the Governor assembles the poor of the city, and then becoming possessed with a devil flings at them not dust or gravel but stones. See, too, in the Acts of Peter and Andrew, the woman whom the Apostles suspend in the air.

IV

The conception of the Holy Spirit as our Lord's mother may be the clue to the second part of the Clementines. May it not be an Ebionite travesty of a Gnostic allegory which described the return of the human soul to its Father and to the Holy Spirit its mother? The original perhaps might have been on the lines of the Gnostic Hymn of the Soul which has been ascribed to Bardesanes. Clement's mother says (falsely) she is an Ephesian. It is at Ephesus that John meets Domna. Clement's mother has not hands, but only the "form of hands"; *cf.* the hand which, in the

passage from Budge's Acts of Paul, the Virgin stretches through the air.

V

Lastly, is it not conceivable that *all* Mary legends were developments of similar Gnostic allusions—purposely ambiguous or misunderstood¹—to the Holy Spirit?

Thus in the supermundane vision in Budge's Acts of Peter our Lord spends three hours in a tabernacle of light with His mother. There is a reason for refusing to identify this mother with the Virgin Mary; for, after the Ascension is over, the Apostles go and *take her the news*. And there is a reason for identifying her with the Holy Spirit; for when Peter sees her in the innermost part of the tabernacle, and hears the angels sing her praises, his "body burns with fire," just as a little earlier, when our Lord had breathed on the Apostles and said "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," "their bodies and their hearts had burned with the light of the Holy Spirit."

I throw out this suggestion—the value of which I am not sufficiently versed in Gnostic lore to decide—because it seems to hint that, for instance, the account of Mary's *περιόδοι* which we examined in Part V. above may be earlier than seems otherwise possible.²

¹ Either by the comparatively orthodox, or by Gnostics of another school, who might receive documents in which our Lord's mother was alluded to in one sense, and misread the allusion in another sense.

² It is not the only document either. The whole of my theory, as I hope to show on another occasion, can be corroborated from the Assumption legends. Thus the summons to the scattered Apostles wherever they might be is exactly like the summons which brought the twelve to Jerusalem. Then, corresponding to the arrival of the Galilean five hundred at Jerusalem, we have

the knocking at the door of the Upper Chamber, of the Virgins from the Mount of Olives who have heard a voice in the night saying, "I say unto you, Virgins of the Mount of Olives, arise, go to Jerusalem, to Mary" (Forbes Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*, p. 99). Then there is the tradition which extends this independent knowledge of the knowledge of "Mary's glory" to all the world; just as the whole existing Church in the persons of the five hundred had known of the Resurrection, so the whole existing Church knows of the Glory of Mary (Mrs Lewis, p. 48). Women flock up to Jerusalem or Bethlehem from all the world (Mrs Lewis, p. 33). Lastly, just as our Lord appeared in physical reality to all the Apostles after a week, so Mary returns after a week's disappearance and resolves all doubts (Forbes Robinson, p. 83). Finally, there are two problems of verbal resemblance. The vision of Mary (Forbes Robinson, p. 93) resembles the Joseph vision in the Acts of Pilate. And the Dormitio Mariæ (Walker, pp. 504 f.) has many reminiscences of the description of Pentecost in Budge's Acts of Peter. I do not intend this note as evidence for my theory. I am too ignorant of the criticism of the Transitus for that. But I would suggest that the study of the Transitus might be fruitful in the hands of better scholars than myself.

If I am asked for a definite theory of origin for the narrative quoted on page 79, I would suggest that it began with the belief that the Holy Spirit left by our Lord to the Apostles (John xx. 22) had been doing, between our Lord's departure and Pentecost, exactly what our Lord had been doing during Easter week—abiding, that is to say, with the Apostles, and yet at the same time appearing to others at a distance.

THE
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

PRINTED BY NEIL AND CO., LTD., EDINBURGH.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

1955

232.5 Q
R 312

Resurrectio Christi

1910					
Jan. 14	Lane	Feb. 3			

232.5 Q

R 312

Q

